

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

Volume VII

JANUARY, 1944

Number I

BRITISH ARCHIVES AND THE WAR¹

I MAY perhaps be allowed to begin by saying how much I appreciate the compliment implied in the invitation kindly conveyed to me by Mr. Buck to take some part in an annual conference of American archivists, and how truly I wish it were possible for me to be present on that occasion. I shall venture to hope that pleasure may prove one day to have been merely postponed, and meanwhile send my most sincere wishes for a successful meeting. I have only to add to these preliminary remarks some apology for a contribution which will be found to be little more than a series of notes; and, what is worse, notes compiled from a personal angle. Archivists in this country—that is to say those few out of a small band whose activities have not been diverted by the needs of the time to other services—have been fully occupied up to now in efforts to preserve their charges from the immediate dangers which successively presented themselves; and if, in happier circumstances, we are now venturing occasionally to turn our minds towards the problems of post-war reconstruction the change of attitude (pleasant as it is) does not make us any less busy. In short it has not been possible as yet to bring together the materials for that comprehensive survey which my title might suggest and which I should have liked to offer.

The Classification of English Archives

In order to make these notes intelligible I must begin by reminding you very briefly, what English archives are. You will notice that I say English. That is not because English archivists are out of touch with their Scottish, Irish, and Welsh colleagues. On the contrary, the closest possible co-operation is maintained. On a small committee of the British Records Association, for example, which has been con-

¹ A paper read by Solon J. Buck, archivist of the United States, in the absence of the writer, at the dinner meeting of seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Princeton, New Jersey, November 15, 1943.

sidering lately important plans for post-war development, three members represent the three sister countries. But in Scotland and Northern Ireland both public administration in general and archives administration in particular differ in important respects from those of England, and the same may be said, with some modifications, of Wales. It is our usual custom therefore, in studying any large question of archival economy, to examine it first as it bears upon, or is illustrated by, archives in England—which are of course larger than those of the other three countries—and then to inquire how far and with what reservations the conclusions reached apply to the remaining parts of the United Kingdom. A similar observation may be made in regard to the archives of the dominions and colonies, which should certainly be included when one speaks of British archives; though here the distinctions are, of course, more marked and the extent to which co-operation between archivists has been developed at present much less.²

English archives then, from which my illustrations will be chiefly drawn, fall, according to a classification now generally recognized,³ into five categories: public (central), public (local), semi-public, private, and ecclesiastical. The first comprehends the surviving archives of all those bodies which we now call public departments or ministries—divisions of the central government which have in the past administered, or do now administer, under King and Parliament, the affairs of the nation as a whole; from the Exchequer, Curia Regis, and Chancery of the twelfth century down to the Treasury, Supreme Court and Home Office, Foreign Office, etc., of the twentieth.

The second (public, local) includes the archives of all those bodies which carry on, and always have carried on, those parts of the country's business which can be decentralized because they affect districts rather than the nation. The machinery through which this is done has altered a good deal through the centuries, but the regional divisions have remained much the same—the counties, the great boroughs which maintain a jurisdiction independent of the counties, and below these a multitude of smaller administrative units. The machinery

² One of the works in progress which the war has stopped is the proposed second volume of the *Guide International des Archives*, which would have covered the archives of all British dominions and colonies, including Cyprus and Malta. Much of the necessary information has actually been collected and will, I fear, be obsolete if, or when, the project can be renewed.

³ It is that used in the *Guide* mentioned in the preceding note and adopted by the British Records Association in Number 1 of its *Reports from Committees*.

which concerns us here, because it is represented by existing archives, was from, roughly, the sixteenth century down to the end of the nineteenth in the counties that of the justices of the peace whose jurisdiction, in origin purely legal, gradually came to cover every department of public administration; in the smaller districts it was that of the parishes, to whose primarily ecclesiastical functions activities of a purely lay character were similarly added. Modern legislation, some fifty years ago, transferred most of these acquired administrative functions from the justices to county councils, from the ecclesiastical parishes to separate civil parishes or to rural and urban district councils. The ancient archives were left for the most part with their original compilers.

In my third division (semi-public) are included all those institutions and corporations so characteristic of this country which, though their original object was and remains private profit, advantage, or satisfaction, have come to discharge public functions—educational, charitable, or social—which are recognized and which give them a certain official status. City companies; universities, colleges, and schools; hospitals and charitable foundations of every kind; the great institutions which govern the legal, medical and other professions; public utility undertakings; commercial bodies such as the great banking and insurance corporations, from the Bank of England and Lloyds downwards—all these come under this heading. All, needless to say, are by their nature compilers of archives; many have been in existence for a very considerable time; and some are of great antiquity, dating back three, four, five centuries or even more, and preserving from those early times a substantial quantity of records.

On the field covered by my fourth category (private archives) I need not expatiate, but there are three points to be noted. First, that it includes of course the archives both of institutions and of individuals; second, that among these are to be found the great accumulations of family papers which sometimes—when members of the family have played an important part in public life—have an official character and may even approximate, as in the case of the Cecil family, the importance and character of state papers; and third, that from dates much earlier than the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when “family papers” begin, there have survived in these same accumulations very large masses of documents connected with the tenure of landed property and in particular the records of manorial

jurisdiction. Let us add for completeness that it includes also, of course, at the other end of the scale, most of the enormous and increasing mass of commercial and professional archives.

My fifth category (ecclesiastical) is really a series of categories. For the division of archives which result from the activities in matters spiritual of the provinces, dioceses, archdeaconries, parishes, and other divisions of the Church of England, and those of the unions, congregations, and so forth of other churches, are really parallel to the civil divisions—national, local, semi-public and private—which we have been distinguishing. In the case of the Church of England, too, the archives almost equal those of civil administration in antiquity, and a number of the others date back for two or three centuries.

The total quantity of archives surviving from all these activities may be gauged by the reflection that the English have always been a conservative, though not a careful, people in such matters, and have had very few revolutions. Actually there are well over ten thousand ancient parishes, practically all preserving at least some archives of a reasonable antiquity, and an even larger number of manors whose records have been listed up to date. The total of charitable foundations of some importance for our purpose must reach well into the thousands. Ancient boroughs number between three hundred and four hundred. But I must not delay you any longer with statistics and estimates of bulk; indeed I owe renewed apologies for the length of this exordium.

The Need for Co-ordination

The point to which I have been leading may now be briefly stated. England differs from all the other great archives-owning countries of Europe in that there is no central control of all this mass of archives. The public records, my first category, have indeed been for a century with only a very few special exceptions under the general superintendence of a single official, the Master of the Rolls, acting through the Public Record Office. But with, again, only a very few exceptions, neither the Master of the Rolls nor the Public Records Office has any authority over the remaining custodians of archives, individual or corporate, nor is there any other authority charged with the duty of supervising any section of them. The Archbishop of Canterbury for example, although naturally he might exert great influence in the matter if he saw fit, is not regarded as having directly

either duty or authority in the matter of the archives of the church as a whole. In fact, one may say that for practical purposes the thousands of archives-owning individuals or institutions, public and private, whom I have named or indicated are all autonomous in the matter of their archives. There is no one who can say to them "do this" or "do not do that." You may possibly find in this state of affairs interesting parallels to draw, or distinctions to note, when you compare it with that which is familiar to you in the case of federal, state, county, and other archives in the United States. In any case you cannot fail to realize how it must affect the thoughts and activities of anyone in England who takes the view that all the archives of the nation, without exception, are by their nature related parts of a single whole and that their treatment should be conditioned by that consideration; still more when it becomes his pre-occupation to devise means of protecting them not merely against the ordinary dangers which may arise from carelessness or neglect in peace-time but against the instant, abnormal, and unpredictable perils of war.

The Situation Up To Date

I must not give the impression that outside the public records no work upon archives has been attempted by the state in England. Apart from a large amount of publication of texts, the old Record Commission of 1800-1837, whose final result was the creation of the Public Record Office, paid some attention in its *Reports* to local as well as national records; and several committees and commissions since then have also issued valuable reports. The Historical Manuscripts Commission, appointed in 1870 and still operating, has not only published many volumes drawn from private archives but also paid some attention to a certain number of those of the ecclesiastical and local categories. A royal commission appointed in 1910 not merely reported upon the present state of local and ecclesiastical archives but made some sweeping recommendations, which have never been implemented, for intervention by the state in this field. Upon two recent occasions, 1924 and 1936, legislation dealing with larger questions has incidentally given the Master of the Rolls and the Public Record Office some connection with particular classes⁴ of records outside the national category, and the first of these had the valuable effect of causing the approval by the Master of the Rolls of

⁴ Manorial and tithe records.

a number of local repositories as suitable places for the deposit of manorial records which the act had placed under his superintendence—a great stimulation to local interest. Lastly a church measure⁵ of 1929 has given to bishops the power—though, alas, not the means—to create diocesan record offices for the reception of parish and other ecclesiastical archives which could not be properly cared for in their original places of custody.

In the period which followed the last war the result of all these pricks to public consciousness began at last to appear in some way other than the publication of texts. Of these there had always been, comparatively speaking, plenty: almost every county had a society devoted more or less to such work. But now there began to manifest itself, here and there and in varying ways, generally under the stimulus of some individual enthusiasm, an apprehension of the fact that conservation and arrangement of the vast masses of surviving documents, even the provision of mere storage facilities for them, might be problems more urgent than the publication of small selections. Public libraries began to make collections of manuscripts and following this to demand assistants specially trained for their custody; and the Library Association and the newly formed School of Librarianship in London made corresponding provision in their curriculum. One county council started an archives department, built a new repository, even added a repairing shop; others followed its example. Deans and chapters raised funds to put their records in order; one large diocese succeeded in implementing—and very successfully—the terms of the church measure I have mentioned. And an increasing stream of custodians—parish clergy, city companies, boroughs, even some of the smaller local authorities—sought from time to time the unofficial advice or help of the Public Record Office. Finally in 1932 the British Records Association, an entirely voluntary organization but having the Master of the Rolls for its president and with the support of influential bodies such as the County Councils Association, came into existence with the express object of co-ordinating all this scattered effort; of encouraging those custodians of archives, still comparatively few, who were interested in the technique of archives keeping; and of stimulating the remaining multitude to follow their example. In the following seven years it achieved a remarkable success—much greater than the handful of persons who

⁵ A church measure is the equivalent in ecclesiastical affairs of an act of Parliament.

started it had ventured to expect: increasing its membership four-fold; establishing contacts with the dominions, colonies, and with foreign countries; holding conferences and organizing exhibitions which aroused public interest considerably beyond the bounds of its own membership; initiating the *Year's Work* and other series of technical publications; and in short it came within sight of converting the idea of archives work as a science and a profession into a practical reality.

And at this point the war came.

The Effects of War

I hope I shall not be thought lacking in a sense of proportion if I say that in the midst of all the dire possibilities with which our minds were naturally obsessed in September, 1939, a few of us could not help thinking with a special pang of its probable effects upon a movement still so young and an organization so imperfect as that I have just sketched. Some of these effects could easily be foreseen, at least in outline, by anyone whose experience went back twenty years and who had a little imagination. In the first place, of course, there was the possibility, so much increased since 1918, of actual destruction of archives by enemy action. Secondly, there was the danger, in some ways more certain, of destruction by our friends; in others words the inevitable call for waste paper in huge quantities for the purposes of munitions, and the efforts of indiscriminating zeal to meet it. And, third, came the less defined but undoubted danger to archives, especially private, semi-public and small local ones, involved in the general re-organization of the community and particularly in the requisitioning of houses, office accommodations, and buildings of all kinds for special war activities.

Only less lamentable than actual destruction was the apprehended discontinuance, if only from motives of economy in labor, of separate archives departments in centers of local government and other places where they had been set up, and the still more certain halt in the process of converting more of such bodies to an active policy in regard to their archives. A corollary to these considerations was of course an end, for an unpredictable period, to our hopes for the development of archival science and the building up in England of a recognized class and profession of archivists. Finally, the British Records Association itself seemed likely to be threatened with temporary eclipse if not with extinction as a result of the call upon all avail-

able energies, money and time to meet the more pressing needs of the nation.

Enemy Action

As you will have gathered from the long and generous review of our *Year's Work in Archives* which appeared in THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST in January, 1943, events have agreeably falsified expectations in some respects. Although there have been many and melancholy losses—one was mentioned in your review and even from our present imperfect knowledge I could cite others not less grievous in every category of archives—there have also been a number of happy and surprising survivals, to mention only three places: in Bristol, in Coventry, and at the Guildhall and other important points in London. Indeed in the case of more than one city company the saving of the muniments has been almost the only consoling feature in the tale of destruction of beautiful and historical things. This applies to at least three of the great companies which in recent years have played host to the British Records Association's annual conference or in other ways assisted its work. In one of these cases, you may have heard the tale already, but it is worth re-telling, the brick-built strong-room was almost all that remained. It was so hot that leather, inside an iron safe within the room itself, was found burned to a cinder—so hot that when, after some days, the company's staff felt obliged to open the door the inrush of fresh air set the contents ablaze. Yet almost all the muniments in that strong room were rescued and almost all are today practically unharmed, although streams of boiling water were added to the last stage of their trials. The documents of another company come to the Record Office from the ruins of a building whose destruction we ourselves had witnessed—it was not two hundred yards away from us—after a long period of immersion in water followed by active fermentation. Our repairing department will not readily forget the long lines of sheets tenderly separated and hung out to dry, nor the smell which accompanied first-aid operations. Yet they also are today hardly any the worse, at least to casual inspection. From the same source a quantity of modern lawyer's papers came to us, more than a year afterwards and still wet; but even these were not, as it proved, irretrievably ruined.

But I must not allow myself to be lured into tales of rescue work or convey the impression that the experience gained in regard to papers drowned or charred—for we have experimented also with that most

delicate problem—has not been paid for at a very dear rate, as indeed have a number of other conclusions which may now be added to the stock of archivists' lore. One of these is a most emphatic confirmation of the view that water, not fire, is the great enemy of the archivist. This does not mean that any measure of protection against fire can be diminished. Although the archivist who has protested in times of peace his fear of the danger from a casual spark may perhaps recall in future, with reminiscent amusement, times when he and his repository have stood for an hour or two under a thick shower of sparks, I do not think he will want to relax precautions. On the contrary, the dictum that stacked archives are extremely difficult things for conflagration to destroy, though demonstrably true, rests on two provisos: first, that the materials surrounding them are non-inflammable (it is the wooden uprights of the shelving or the wooden supports of the roof which have done the damage in so many cases), and second, that sufficient staff is present to deal with the fire in its earliest stages.⁶ Conviction of the necessity for plentiful fire-watchers is perhaps the knowledge for which London and other cities have paid most dearly. For the archivist fire-guards must always have a special function—that of preventing the necessity for floods of water. Not all the drowned documents have been so fortunate as those I have mentioned above. One of the things we have learned is the incredible speed with which mildew and fermentation may work in favorable circumstances afterwards.

Precautions

That last remark may lead to a few words about precaution in general. Naturally precautionary measures had been under discussion officially for some time before the war, although extra-officially it was more difficult to raise such questions. But after 1938, when there were still many who could not believe, until it occurred, that even Germans would go to the length of absolutely indiscriminate air-bombardment, preparation was a practical matter. At the Record Office, and I dare say elsewhere, structural alterations including such matters as facilities for access to all parts of the roof, above and below, and the installation of necessary equipment proved a surprisingly large task; but the possibilities of actually bomb-proof

⁶ At the Public Record Office we have throughout maintained night and day shifts, although the elaborately organized band with which we started has of course been much depleted since.

cover narrowed themselves upon investigation to the use of mines or tunnels. Since the quantity of such places was limited, and the installation necessary to make them suitable for manuscripts elaborate and costly, the archivist, hampered by the bulk of his charges, was at a disadvantage, especially in competition with the more obvious and spectacular value of the contents of museums and galleries. Comparatively few accumulations of archives have in fact found such protection, although there are notable exceptions.

On the other hand the policy of removal from built-up areas and distribution of risk by the use of more than one temporary repository and by the separation of classes which to some extent duplicated each other has been practiced on a large scale by the Public Record Office and preached by the British Records Association. The association has also been able to help in arranging the offer of hospitality by repositories in comparatively safe areas to those less fortunately placed from the point of view either of bombardment or of possible invasion. It is probable however that many custodians have taken this kind of precaution by means of a variety of *ad hoc* arrangements which their special circumstances made possible. If there were a proposal after the war to put a plaque on every country house that has acted as temporary repository for some quantity, large or small, of archives, public or private, I fancy that a large number of plaques would be needed.

At the Public Record Office evacuation had to be preceded by the very difficult business of selection. Ultimately a series of categories was prepared of classes to be successively removed if conditions allowed. The basis of choice was that a class (*a*) had not been printed and (*b*) was intrinsically, *i.e.*, in relation to the whole group of records of which it formed a part, of primary importance. Some concession was made also to the predilections of historians and other students, and to popular or spectacular values. In the end it was unexpectedly found possible, although the process took the best part of three years, to remove the whole of these categories and an extra one, consisting of specimens from classes not evacuated, in about ninety thousand carefully numbered and indexed packages—a weight of about two thousand tons. The buildings in which they have been bestowed include a castle, private mansions, a prison, and a casual ward. I need not tell an audience of archivists what it has meant to carry out these moves and to find manning for the temporary repositories from a small staff already much depleted and charged in addition with the task of defending the London office.

We entertain no illusions as to the future course and potentialities of enemy action. It is possible for instance that another high explosive bomb—you have heard of the first from the press so there is no harm in mentioning it—may do more than demonstrate an unsuspected usefulness in the Gothic towers of the Record Office. Even as I write the enemy is talking much of new terrors in store. We merely record thankfulness mixed with our grief for past losses, and hope for the future. It is the motto of the Cockney in 1940: "Go to bed hopeful and wake up thankful."

Microphotography

A precaution which I have not mentioned but which has been freely used is that of microphotography. Many large business houses had recourse to it in the period immediately preceding the war in order to safeguard their current papers; a service was arranged for solicitors by the Law Society, and so forth. But in addition there have been a number of schemes covering older archives, sometimes on a small, sometimes on a larger scale. I shall only mention three of the latter. The first is that initiated in the United States by which machines installed at the Public Record Office and certain other important centers are making films of great series of documents for deposit in the Library of Congress—a scheme equally beneficial to American students, who can use the films, and to English archivists, who see large classes of their documents given something approaching a double chance of survival. The second is an arrangement by which, at the Public Record Office the same machine is operated by the staff on duty by night, when raids permit, for the filming of early registers of probate from all courts from the fourteenth to the sixteenth or seventeenth century—a series or rather a quantity of series of records of extreme value which were not included in the American program. The third is a scheme for the filming at various centers of all parish registers. In one large diocese (Lincoln) this has actually been completed along with other work, and the diocesan custodian responsible reports a very great incidental gain in knowledge of the state of parish records in her district. A good deal has also been done in other dioceses.

In this big development in the use of microphotography by archivists we have a positive gain from the war: not only by the making of the films—which, to tell the truth, I think may prove to be of varying value—but by exploration of the limitations as well as the

possibilities of the process when applied to archives.⁷ In view of the great part which it is, I believe, destined to play in the development of archival work in the future this constitutes a real advance.

Paper Salvage

From precautions against our enemies it is an easy transition to precautions against our friends; the danger in both cases being that of indiscriminate destruction. The word salvage, by the way, has in current usage the initial disadvantage of two exactly opposite meanings: that of "salving" for the national need papers of all sorts, from omnibus tickets (literally) to records, which are presumed to be valueless; and that of saving papers which are not valueless from "salvage." In this instance the course of the war, which has increased the shortage of pulp in unexpected ways, has made the event worse than our anticipations. The necessary campaign for collection of waste has been comprehensively planned, tremendously publicized and carried out as it well could be by a multitude of enthusiasts who in many cases were not very knowledgeable. The result has been to present the British Records Association, which has shouldered the main responsibility for defense, with ever-fresh problems as fresh classes of local, private, and ecclesiastical records presented themselves in the light of new sources of supply to the imagination of the enthusiasts. Some of the attempts to parry these successive attacks are reflected in the series of *B.R.A. Memoranda*, a set of which, with some miscellanea, is annexed to this paper.⁸ Apart from publications, broadcasts by the Master of the Rolls, appeals made through local libraries, letters to the newspapers and so forth, the association has worked through an organization of some hundreds of voluntary "referees" all over the country who are prepared to advise salvage officers and proposing contributors to the salvage "drives." You have

⁷ Some notes on this subject appear in the current issue (No. 17) of the *Bulletin* of the Technical Section of the British Records Association.

⁸ The annexes, all issued by the British Records Association, are entitled:

1. *Obsolete Poor Law Records. Brief Hints on Review and Selection for Salvage.* N.d., 1 p.
2. *The Safeguarding of Parish Records, a Memorandum.* April, 1942. 2 pp.
3. *Records. What Should We Try to Save?* Memo. No. 3. May, 1942, repr. Aug., 1942. 2 pp.
4. *Salvage from Solicitors' Offices.* Memo. No. 4. Aug., 1942. 1 p.
5. *Old Parchments.* Memo. No. 5. Oct., 1942. 1 p.
6. *First Aid for Damaged Manuscripts.* Memo. No. 6. Dec., 1942. 2 pp.
7. *Modern Records. What May We Destroy?* Memo. No. 7. March, 1943, reissued April, 1943, new eds. May and June, 1943, reissued July, 1943. 5 pp.

heard, I think, of this in the review already cited, but I may perhaps record here that the organization is itself a monument of what may be done by mere devotion. It has been carried on, with all the vast correspondence involved, almost entirely by a single person.

What measure of success has been achieved by these various means will probably never be fully known. Even the larger losses will transpire only very slowly, as students here and there find lamentable gaps, after the war. I will not harrow your feelings with relation of the tales—some, I fear, true—which have reached us from time to time, of old established commercial houses which emptied their muniment rooms by the simple process of emptying them, or incumbents who placed the church chest at the disposal of the paper merchant. But that we have prevented quite a considerable amount of destruction is, I think, certain. I will instance only one local authority which was not only dissuaded from a scheme already approved for destroying the whole of the county's old poor law records but converted to the view that it was good policy to preserve a really representative accumulation of every class of them.

The association's method has been throughout to obtain the concurrence of the salvage authorities in its propaganda, to emphasize the relatively small amount which it was desired to preserve, to rely as much as possible on personal contacts, and to offer its aid not merely in saving but in destroying.⁹ There is in fact much work for the archivist to do in the way of encouraging intelligent elimination, as well as preservation. The demand for our latest *Memorandum*, which deals with legitimate destruction in accumulations of modern documents, although it has never been used as a circular it has six editions or issues in as many months, shows the value of this line of approach. The salvage campaign has at this point provided and unexpected but welcome opportunity for the association to spread knowledge and incidentally to improve its own position with the general public.

The British Records Association

From the preceding sentence and other indications in these notes you will have gathered that the association has found plenty of special tasks during this War. It has succeeded also, in spite of all preoccupa-

⁹ The Public Record Office, which by statute controls to a very considerable extent the elimination of papers by public departments, has also been very active during the war in hastening and encouraging the destruction of those papers which are not destined for permanent preservation.

tions, in finding people to do them. I may now add that its general work, though naturally much restricted, has not lapsed at any point. Committee work and printing have not ceased—indeed, as you will have gathered, they have found new channels. The annual conference, much shorn, has taken place in London each year—in 1940, to the accompaniment of an air raid, and should be held in 1943 at very much the same time at which these notes will be presented in America. All being well, members will meet in the hall—one of the few which survives uninjured—of a great city company. Propaganda for the maintenance and increase of membership, in peace-time a most important activity because membership means public interest, must obviously cease during war. But membership, although it has decreased,¹⁰ has not done so to anything like the extent anticipated and on the other hand there has been a small but steady flow of new members, which gives me the opportunity to record with gratitude the accession, in a dark hour, of a little band of new members from America—a very heartening gesture. We are also in hopes that the numerous contacts made in connection with the salvage campaign, especially with private and semi-public owners of modern commercial and professional archives, may be turned to account later.

The last remark may introduce the mention of one more point at which our work has drawn unexpected profit from the war. When, to meet the dangers of air bombardment and possible invasion, the whole country was divided into regions under commissioners for civil defence, the association endeavored to get in touch with these new authorities in view of possible eventualities of all kinds. One result of this was the circulation of a pamphlet of instructions for first aid to damaged manuscripts, since reissued through several channels. An even more important outcome was the preparation, for the information of commissioners and their staff, of the *Regional List* of addresses at which there were or should be accumulations of archives. It was not complete, for it excluded deliberately two of the largest classes—manorial and parish archives—and practically excluded certain others, and in many respects it was very definitely an improvisation. But it was the first attempt ever made at a national register of archives of all categories and as such had an importance which may well go far beyond the immediate occasion which produced it. It may

¹⁰ Before the war institutional members numbered about three hundred and individual six hundred.

form the basis for more elaborate, perhaps even for official, action in the future.

The Archivist in England: Future Developments

What form will this future action take? The archivist's profession has inevitably been for the last four years in a state of almost suspended development. Not entirely so: There is, for instance, at least one county authority which has actually started a new archives department during the war; and there are signs of stirring in other places. But development of the profession means two things, the provision of new posts and the availability of young people to take them; and both of these have practically ceased for obvious reasons. The School of Librarianship, which provided training, has closed down; and talk of a possible special diploma is in abeyance.

On the other hand we have now advanced so far in optimism as to be thinking of reconstruction and of the unique opportunity it will offer for new developments. This, in our case, could mean, if it occurred at all, only one thing: an increase in public recognition of the value of archives and, by implication, an increase in the amount of work to be done and in the number of people called upon to do it. In other words it would mean the final emergence of that profession, that organized science of archives, which at present, outside the Public Record Office, has so tenuous an existence in England. We are at the moment discussing this possibility and the best way of converting it into a reality. Let me conclude by telling you the lines on which, it seems to me, development might proceed.

They can be summed up in one word, co-operation—co-operation between the state and the local, ecclesiastical, semi-public, and private custodian or owner; co-operation between custodians in small groups formed upon regional¹¹ or other considerations; co-operation in the planning of work, in the pooling of knowledge, in the actual housing, sometimes, of the archives and making them accessible to students, in the provision of technical facilities, notably for repair work, even in the sharing of the services of ambulatory archivists. I do not think we shall arrive easily at any great measure of centralization. I even

¹¹ A singularly encouraging and promising plan is actually under discussion at present by which three county councils, the diocese covering their district and the corresponding chapter, and all the independent boroughs in the same area (with, probably, a large number of smaller units attached) would organize a single record office for their joint needs. Could similar arrangements, *mutatis mutandis*, be produced elsewhere a long step would have been taken towards the solution of a national problem.

hope we shall not, for the idea of unimpaired custody as an ingredient of primary importance in the evidential value of archives is clearly best served by leaving them as far as possible in the hands of their natural custodians. On the other hand it is very obvious that the dangers of neglect, destruction, or dispersal will not be smaller, and there is ground for fearing that they may be very much greater, in the midst of all the changes and chances which the near future may bring, than they have been in the past. Many of those thousands of custodians, unless they receive both guidance and help, will fail in their duty through ignorance, carelessness, or sheer lack of means. It is no use to expect the smaller local or ecclesiastical authorities—how much less the ordinary private owners—to install a complete archives establishment, but they may be brought to desire and enabled to secure their share in the benefits of a common organization.

How far in the turmoil of post-war adjustments, of competing claims on public attention and of demands for public economy, it will be possible to realize such hopes as I have indicated, time alone will show. But the fact that they exist and are even being voiced, after four such years as these have been for us, is something for which we may be thankful.

Conclusion

And the importance of all this? The justification of so much planning and thought in time of war?

I am not to attempt here an exposition of the value of archives, but if I were asked to define the creed of the archivist in four words I should say "the sanctity of evidence." It is not, primarily at any rate, his business to use or interpret his charges; he need not be interested in their contents—indeed it is in some ways an advantage if he is not, for that detachment preserves him from the temptation to *ex parte* procedure. His training, methods, and rules of conduct are in fact, or should be, such that he can at a pinch make shift to perform his functions faithfully without even understanding the meaning of the documents entrusted to him. His part is simply to conserve intact every scrap of evidence which not only the contents of the documents but their form, makeup, provenance, and position in relation to other documents have to offer. His aim is to provide, without prejudice or after-thought, for all who honestly wish to know, the means of knowledge. Viewed in these aspects the good archivist is the most selfless devotee of truth the modern world produces.

In an age in which untruthfulness is not only increasingly condoned but in certain quarters and by certain powers elevated to the status of a science and prescribed as a rule in the conduct of affairs—in such an age our profession may, I venture to submit, have a part to play the importance of which it would be difficult to exaggerate.

HILARY JENKINSON

Public Record Office, London

THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

NOVEMBER 15 AND 16, 1943

AT THE REQUEST of the Office of Defense Transportation the seventh annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists was held not in October as originally contemplated but in November. With the exception of the initial session, which convened in the Trustees Room, Chancellor Green Library, Princeton University, all sessions were held in the Nassau Tavern. The registered attendance was eighty-three. This total was made up as follows: Canada, 1; Colorado, 1; Connecticut, 2; Delaware, 1; District of Columbia, 33; Illinois, 3; Maryland, 3; Michigan, 2; Mississippi, 2; North Carolina, 4; New Jersey, 4; New York, 10; Ohio, 3; Pennsylvania, 2; Texas, 1; Tennessee, 1; Virginia, 5; Vermont, 4; Wisconsin, 1. An unofficial count of attendance at the respective sessions produced this result: first morning, 60; first luncheon, 69; first afternoon, 78; annual dinner, 89; second morning, 56; second luncheon, 82; second afternoon, 64; second evening, 70. It is understood that attendance at informal sessions was likewise maintained at a high level.

The initial session was presided over by Leon de Valinger, Public Archives Commission, Delaware. The first speaker was Victor Gondos, Jr., the National Archives, whose topic was "Archivists and Architects: The Nature, Scope, and Degree of Co-operation of the Archivist, Architect, and Public Authorities in the Planning and Execution of the Archival Building Program." Archivists should consider now, it was emphasized, the structures they should like to see erected as one phase of the anticipated post-war reconstruction program. Preliminary plans and outline specifications are prerequisites for allocations of funds. Methods to be employed in the selection of the architects were pointed out. Not until preliminary drawings have been approved does the architect prepare working drawings. The archivist should supply the architect with tables of estimated space requirements and with a complete survey of the building site. In planning, the architect must take care to provide efficient space distribution, service facilities, and damage prevention. The archivist can assist the architect by supplying him with information concerning weights of

records and their containers. Even though it be necessary in planning stack areas to restrict them to artificial lights and air there appears to be no sound reason for the extension of this restriction to offices.

Mr. Gondos was followed by William J. Van Schreeven, Virginia State Library, who presented "Equipment Needs to be Considered in Constructing Post-War Archival Depositories." According to this speaker, a prerequisite is that archivist and architect determine the kind of building needed. Of prime importance is stack equipment, the goal in selection of which should embrace interchangeability of parts and protection of records. Experiments led to the decision to employ in the new Virginia State Library Building shelves of only two widths and to engage them by means of brackets below rather than above. Cardboard containers are preferable to metal ones. It may be desirable to arrange containers of some types of records, for example maps and photoprints, around the walls of the reading room. Requirements of reading, catalogue, and restoration rooms were touched upon. The Barrow laminating machine was recommended. Needs of the photographic laboratory, both for large and small institutions, were discussed in some detail. The preferred fumigation vault is the vacuum type using a mixture of ethylene oxide and carbon dioxide gas. Cleaning by air pressure was endorsed. The type of flattening device selected should depend upon volume of work to be done.

The third paper at this session was "Some Observations on the Planning of Archives Buildings" by Louis A. Simon, of the Public Buildings Administration. In the writer's absence it was read by the chairman. In the beginning it was noted that an archives building has the special characteristic that it must be so planned as to accommodate not only the records initially placed in it but an annual increment difficult to estimate. The arrangement of the building should not be determined until after the archivist has been appointed. Successive future enlargements must be assumed and the first of these may be arbitrarily fixed at from twenty-five to fifty years. A rapidly increasing volume of records would justify construction of a larger building initially than would otherwise be the case. For a local building the site chosen may be sufficiently large to permit additions; for a national building, such as the National Archives building, the site may be so restricted in size as to require construction of future additional units at other locations. To achieve protection against high explosive bombs requires the outlay of sums generally regarded as

prohibitive. Serious consideration should be given to plans calling for archival buildings to serve in part as shrines, for example, the National Archives building, since amount of space available for records will be affected.

Presiding over the first day's luncheon conference was Edna Louise Jacobsen, New York State Library. The managing editor of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*, Theodore C. Pease, had prepared a paper, "An Editor Looks at his Non-Contributors," which in his absence was read by Karl L. Trever, of the National Archives.

The unpopular craft of editor was wittily defended. The principle followed in editing *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* has been that a contributor has no rights which an editor is bound to respect. Virtually all writers may misquote, get dates wrong, or otherwise be found guilty of nodding; it is a duty of the editor therefore to assist the scholar in the telling of the actual factual truth. Uniformity of presentation is essential. Delays in publication have been owing to necessity of editorial rechecking and styling and to failures of persons to submit copy on time. A plea was made for submission of news notes and articles to the editors, it being pointed out that this publication had continually been struggling against a shortage of manuscripts despite the fact that archivists in this country have been and are doing many things worth telling one another about.

The chairman of the first afternoon session was James E. Downes, New Jersey Public Record Office. "The Archives of Princeton University" were described by Thomas J. Wertenbaker of that institution. Of these archives, housed on the campus in Nassau Hall, the most valuable are the trustees' minutes, which date back to 1748 and therefore virtually to the inception of the institution. These reflect the development of educational policy, changing concepts of discipline, curricular trends, building construction, and such intramural controversies as that between President Woodrow Wilson and Dean Andrew F. West. Of only lesser value are the faculty minutes, running from 1787 to date. Numerous financial records include series of ledgers and an account book, beginning in 1750, maintained by President Aaron Burr. Presidential correspondence, unhappily, has not been retained by the university, although it has been presented with the official correspondence of two presidents, John McLean and Francis L. Patton. Series of somewhat less moment are minutes of academic departments and of the university's two literary societies;

of the latter, there are more than two hundred volumes, the earliest reaching back to Revolutionary days.

Attention shifted from university to railroad archives when Herbert O. Brayer under the title, "I've Been Working on the Railroad," portrayed his activities as archivist of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad. The economic history of the Rocky Mountain region can almost be written in terms of railways. Citing numerous topics on which railway records would throw new or additional light, it was remarked that "the vast quantity of official . . . documents . . . of almost every American railroad constitute one of the most important unused reservoirs of source material for the history of this nation." That they have remained unused is in large measure owing to the deplorable conditions under which they have been stored. Illustrations were drawn from the records survey undertaken by the speaker as his initial project when appointed archivist on November 15, 1941. A subsequent project was the installation of a program dealing with noncurrent records; this includes not only microfilming on a grand scale as part of an adequate disposal system, but also setting up a "historical collection" of some five thousand documents and fifteen thousand photographs. Another project has been the establishment of a "current records division" with authority transcending department and bureau lines.

At the annual dinner Christian Gauss, Princeton University, presided. "The Navy Department's War Record" was set forth by Robert G. Albion of that department. The speaker explained that the motive underlying his appointment in February, 1943, as "recorder of naval administration" was to insure a contemporary, planned record of naval administration during the second World War. Tribute was paid to the Office of Records Administration, headed by Lieutenant-Commander Emmett J. Leahy, and its aggressive program which includes elimination of accumulations of noncurrent, valueless records and the "birth control" of records by such devices as the streamlining of correspondence. A contrast was drawn between the practice of the Office of Naval Records and Library in segregating certain operational naval records of the first World War and the current effort to retain records collections as unified wholes on the basis of provenance. The second World War records are "tailor-made" as exemplified by the application of the requirement for war diaries to all units afloat and some units ashore. The administrative reference

service seeks to place in the hands of administrators as aids to the solution of current or anticipated problems studies of the manner in which similar first World War problems were attacked.

Owing to his inability to be present in person, the paper on "British Archives and the War" prepared for the occasion by Hilary Jenkinson, Public Record Office, London, was read at the annual dinner meeting by Solon J. Buck, archivist of the United States. A distinction must be drawn, it was explained, between British archives and English archives, from which latter illustrations were chiefly drawn. English archives fall into five categories: public (central); public (local); semi-public; private; and ecclesiastical. England differs from other leading European "archives-owning countries" in that it has "no central control of all this mass of archives." Progress toward effecting co-ordination of efforts by controlling authorities was notable and prospects for future progress bright when war came in September, 1939. Through enemy action archives suffered from fire and water. Precautions against enemy action that have been practised on a large scale include removal from built-up areas and distribution of risk. A positive gain from the war has been the extensive use of microphotography. Campaigns for paper salvage have kept archivists alert to prevent serious losses, but they have co-operated by urging prompt disposal of valueless archives. The general work of the British Records Association, although restricted by the war, has not lapsed at any point. Its membership has declined, but it has still been able to hold its annual conference in London each year. Archivists are already thinking of reconstruction in which it is believed that the keynote should be co-operation among offices and persons whose activities will affect archives. War-time planning for reconstruction is justified by the archivist's creed, which is the sanctity of evidence, and aim, which is to provide, without prejudice or after-thought, for all who wish to know, the means of knowledge.

At the annual business meeting the following were elected for the ensuing year to the indicated offices: Margaret C. Norton, president; Julian P. Boyd, vice-president; Lester J. Cappon, secretary; Helen L. Chatfield, treasurer. Solon J. Buck was likewise elected to the council, but for a five-year term.

Serving as chairman of the morning session on November 16 was L. E. Donaldson, of the United States Department of Agriculture. Owing to illness his paper on "The Federal Disposal Act of July 7, 1943" could not be completed by Marcus W. Price. With scant warn-

ing therefore Philip C. Brooks, also of the National Archives staff, was requested to present this subject. He took note of the initial disposal act of 1889, the executive order of 1912, and the statutes of 1939 and 1940. Shortcomings of this earlier legislation were summarized and it was emphasized that the act of 1943 is designed to insure the retention of federal records possessing "administrative, legal, research, or other value" and expedite the disposal of federal records lacking such value. The "scheduling" provision of the measure, novel in federal experience, was explained and it was pointed out that on the basis of estimates supplied by agencies several millions of dollars can be saved annually by effective utilization of the new legislation.

"The Disposal of Useless State Archives" was discussed by Christopher Crittenden, North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, who took note of the fact that seventeen states have enacted no legislation concerning disposal of non-current state archives. A few states have authorized records custodians to dispose of enumerated series of records. Fifteen states have authorized disposal upon approval by a designated competent office or official or by a commission of which a designated competent official is a member. A few states permit disposal merely upon approval of the state archival agency. The speaker favored that type of statute authorizing disposal by office of origin or custody following approval by the archival agency. The problem receives chief attention in states where there are efficient archival agencies. In a number of states disposal schedules are being worked out. The speaker concluded with a description of disposal procedure in his own state of North Carolina.

Although unable to attend the meeting, C. D. Crandall, Interstate Commerce Commission, had prepared a paper on "Regulations Governing the Preservation and Destruction of Records of Persons Subject to Parts I, III and IV of the Interstate Commerce Act." This was read by Roland P. Monson, Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Interstate Commerce Act as amended authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the preservation and destruction of records of carriers, lessors and other persons subject to its jurisdiction. The initial regulation, issued in 1907, required preservation of all statistical and accounting records except for seventeen listed categories, disposable after specified periods of time. At present preservation periods range from six months through fifteen years to permanency. Unless listed records may not be destroyed. Regulations

provide for appointment by carriers of officials to supervise the destruction of records. Although the commission is not concerned with the method of destruction, a certificate, identifying the records destroyed, is required to be filed with the commission. In a number of instances the commission has authorized petitioning carriers to dispose of paper records when microfilm copies were to be retained. To illustrate the importance of the work it was pointed out that recently, as a prerequisite to petitioning the commission to revise or rewrite its applicable 1915 regulations covering destruction of records, regional and general committees of pipe line carriers spent almost three years in research. The consequent recommendations received about six months of study and review by the commission before the rewritten regulations were issued effective January 1, 1943.

Following his reading of the paper by Mr. Crandall, Mr. Monson briefly described the analogous work of the Civil Aeronautics Board in regulating the preservation and destruction of the records of air carriers subject to the board's jurisdiction. Foundations were laid, it was explained, in 1930-1934, when the postmaster general prescribed the system of accounts to be kept by airlines operating under mail contracts. In 1938 statutory authority was conferred on the Civil Aeronautics Board to prescribe retention periods for records of air carriers. On March 1, 1942, the board issued a schedule in which were specified the records that might be destroyed after the lapse of a specified time. On November 15, 1943, a revised schedule became effective, the revision embodying many suggestions made by carriers on the basis of experience. In this schedule retention periods range from one to ten years except for records to be permanently retained.

James Fesler, War Production Board, was presiding officer at the second luncheon conference. The speaker was Vernon G. Setser, Department of War, the topic "Can the War History Projects Contribute to the Solution of Federal Records Problems?" Federal, state, local, business, and other classes of records are accumulating and will continue to accumulate at a great rate. As an experiment in the utilization of masses of recent records the federal war history projects possess chief significance for the archivist. The trend appears to be that comprehensive research projects can only be carried out by teams of research workers and auxiliary personnel. Standards are lacking for reports of recorded experience prepared for improvement of current administration and administrators generally are not clear as to type of report needed by them. The fact that researchers have found

that the usual administrative records of an agency are not sufficient to provide a complete story of its administrative development suggests the requirement that, when needed, supplementary types of records be produced. In order to reduce bulk of mammoth record groups brutal decisions regarding disposal of record groups or portions thereof will have to be made. If war history workers shall have written the appropriate story of administrative development, such will possibly make less necessary the indefinite preservation of large portions of affected record groups. The answer to the question posed in the title is in the affirmative.

At the afternoon session on November 16 the chairman was Harold S. Burt, Connecticut State Library. In his paper, "Librarians and Archivists—Some Aspects of their Partnership," Herman Kahn, the National Archives, pointed out that in the case of his agency, and probably to the surprise of many persons, most services on collections of transferred records are rendered to agencies of origin. The notion that transferred records of a governmental agency should be arranged by subject content, much as are books in a library, is fallacious since that which is comparable to the individual book is not a single paper or dossier but the entire group or records received from the agency. For the archivist to dismember and distribute a record group would be analogous to the librarian's breaking up a book and distributing its chapters, according to their subject matter, on his shelves. Because no one can ever know to what use records may be put in future the breaking up and reorganization of record groups according to a preconceived scheme is always a catastrophe. To solve the searcher's problem of locating record groups or parts thereof containing information on a given subject the archivist must provide checklists, guides, and other types of finding mediums.

In discussing "Archival Needs to be Considered in Planning an American Post-War Stabilization Program with Special Reference to the Needs of the States and Their Subdivisions," Hermann F. Robinton, New York State Education Department, used his state to illustrate a type of post-war planning that may be applicable elsewhere. It is planned to set up regional archival depositories in buildings at Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Albany, Poughkeepsie, New York City, and on Long Island. Each of these regional centers was selected as the result of a survey of economic trends and needs. To cover the counties in each region would be assigned a records supervisor. To the regional depositories would be transferred noncur-

rent but valuable records. The financing of such depositories can be facilitated by their being planned as war memorials. For any long range archival program the assistance of a state planning commission is desirable if not necessary. Also needed is the co-operation of the office of state controller; if it can be demonstrated that by records administration savings to the treasury have been effected, an allocation to archival activities of perhaps one-half of one per cent of the state tax can be promoted. Of potential value would be the introduction into state colleges of courses for the training of archivists.

On the evening of November 16 the Society's program reached its finale in the joint session with the American Association for State and Local History. This "town meeting" session, presided over by Herbert A. Kellar, McCormick Historical Association, was devoted to a discussion of practical questions pertaining to archives and materials for state and local history. Miss Margaret Norton and James F. Kenny addressed themselves to the question "What distinctions should be made between archives and historical manuscripts?" The former, in a paper read in her absence by C. Kenneth Blood, pointed out that in the case of true archives custody is unbroken; the latter concluded that classification into one or other category depended upon the individual document or documents and the application of common sense. Herbert E. Angel, in discussing "What principles of selectivity should be used with respect to the collection and preservation of archival materials?" suggested as criteria three questions: Who will use the records? For what purpose? Within what period? In reply to "What principles of selectivity should be used with respect to the collection and preservation of materials for state and local history?" William Francis English maintained that a collecting agency should seek institutional materials, papers of lesser lights as well as of persons of prominence, documents of regional or local significance, and relatively current records whether of peace-time or war-time. "What is the function of the college librarian with relation to the collection and preservation of materials for state and local history?" was answered by Clarence Paine by stating that in the absence of any other agency of collection and preservation the responsibility should be assumed by the college librarian in so far as resources permit. If two or more such agencies exist within the locality, co-operative effort should be the goal; control over collections within two or more agencies can be exercised by means of a union catalogue.

In discussing "What is the function of the manuscript and book

dealer in relation to the collection and preservation of materials for state and local history?" Forest H. Sweet observed that the dealer's interest is commercial; his prices are his chief concern, being fixed at the highest level the traffic will bear; and in order to prosper he must learn considerable of the lore of the historian and archivist. The scheduled discussion of "What is the relation of the Bibliography of American Imprints to the collection and preservation of archives and materials for state and local history?" by Douglas C. McMurtrie unfortunately did not take place.

W. NEIL FRANKLIN

The National Archives

THE MANUSCRIPT COPYING PROGRAM IN ENGLAND

IT WAS the mass bombing of London early in the war that impressed upon us the seriousness of the danger to important collections in English libraries. During eight months of "phony war" many collections had not been evacuated or adequately protected before explosives and incendiaries rained from the sky.

With the fall of France various individuals and organizations in this country became concerned about the problem. It remained, however, for the American Council of Learned Societies to take the first constructive step to preserve some of these treasures. Early in the summer of 1940 Dr. Waldo Leland called a meeting in Washington of those most interested to discuss possible methods whereby copies of books and manuscripts in danger of destruction could be brought to this country. After various procedures had been reviewed, it was agreed that microfilm offered the greatest promise in that it was inexpensive, small in bulk, could be processed rapidly, and allowed duplicate copies to be made at a low cost. At the conclusion of the meeting the Committee on Microcopying Materials for Research was appointed. Later it was made a permanent committee of the American Council of Learned Societies.¹

During the summer Dr. Kellar circularized historians with a view to determining their wants and needs. The "want list" compiled as a result of this circularization assumed amazing proportions. It showed full recognition among American scholars of the value and importance of English manuscript holdings and of American needs for copies of them.

In the fall the Rockefeller Foundation generously provided a sizable grant for the specific purpose of copying, in England, manuscripts in danger of destruction through bombing. With the program a definite reality, the appointment of a Sub-committee on Selection,

¹ The committee originally had the following members: Chairman, Keyes Metcalf, Harvard University; Secretary, Vernon Tate, the National Archives; Archibald MacLeish, Library of Congress; Herbert Kellar, McCormick Historical Association; and George Schwegmann, Library of Congress. This committee was later renamed the Joint Committee on Microcopying Materials for Research of the National Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, and American Council of Education, and the following new members added: Evan J. Crane, Ohio State University; Thomas P. Fleming, Medical Library, Columbia University; Harold W. Jones, Army Medical Library; W. H. Kenerson, National Research Council; Mark A. May, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University; Donald J. Shank, American Council on Education; and Irwin Stewart, Washington, D.C.

under the direction of Dr. Kellar, gave assurance that the needs of all fields of scholarly interest would be considered. For the first time a long-cherished dream, whereby copies of the important manuscript collections would be available in this country, became a possibility. The plan was to deposit microfilm negatives in the Library of Congress where they would be available for duplication to any accredited scholar at a very low cost. The Modern Language Association through its Rotograph Series had followed such a plan with considerable success, but the scope and number of manuscripts covered was limited, whereas this program contemplated the copying of whole collections!

In January, 1941, the committee appointed University Microfilms of Ann Arbor, Michigan, to undertake the actual microfilming of the materials selected by Dr. Kellar's committee. This firm already had cameras operating in English depositories, so that the work could be started with a minimum of delay. Further, Mr. Arundell Esdaile, formerly secretary of the British Museum and president of the British Library Association, kindly undertook to approach the custodians of the numerous collections for the support and co-operation so essential to the success of the project. Needless to say, the reaction of the English librarians was all that could be hoped for, and almost without exception enthusiastic support was assured.

The staff of the Early Modern English Dictionary at the University of Michigan, representing the needs of the modern language scholars in the United States, was drawn into the task of selection. In less than two weeks this staff designated over five thousand manuscripts of particular interest in various fields—medicine, science, law, music, history, philology, and literature. Selection in all instances was guided by both the importance of the manuscript and its availability in contemporary reprints. If a reprint was available the manuscript was not selected for copying. Shortly after the completion of the choices just described, the Committee on Selection submitted approved lists.

Additional camera equipment was purchased and shipped abroad as rapidly as delivery could be made. Fortunately all reached England safely. Limitations on the supply of equipment, however, made it impossible to operate in libraries other than those having large collections. These were the British Museum, London, and its evacuation center, the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth; the Bodleian Library at Oxford University; the Public Record Office,

London, and one of its evacuation points; and the Cambridge University and College libraries.

The raw negative film is purchased in England and processed there. After inspection it is delivered to the American Embassy in London and shipped to the Library of Congress by diplomatic pouch. The hundred-foot reels are numbered consecutively and are shipped in lots of five. In this way it can be determined if any are lost in transit. Such an accident has happened but once, and missing rolls were later replaced.

The scope of the original project was extended considerably after work was begun. The original grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to the American Council of Learned Societies of \$30,000 was later increased by an additional \$100,000 and the project expanded correspondingly.

The committee has planned a broad program designed to bring to this country a representative selection of manuscript holdings touching on many fields of scholarly interest. Some indication of the wide variety of material to be included can be gained from a few examples taken from the "want lists" submitted. It should be realized that each of the lists may contain as many as a thousand or more manuscripts. In most instances the practice has been to copy the series or collection in its entirety. On order, for example, are the following items from the Public Record Office: 105 Pipe Rolls, or declared accounts of the Pipe Office; Colonial Office Papers, Classes 5, 10, 24, 29, 38, 43, 72, 124, 128, 153, 166, 195, 218, 224, 227, 254, 259, and 326, all relating to the North American colonies; the Amherst Papers of the War Office; records of the Chancery (charter, close, and patent rolls); memoranda rolls of the Exchequer, 1632-1660; State Papers, Domestic; Monastic Cartularies; Common Pleas Rolls; King's Bench Plea Rolls; and High Court of Admiralty Papers. From the British Museum there are wanted the Register of the Privy Council, the Cottonian and Harleian Manuscripts, portions of the Hardwicke and Newcastle papers from the Additional Manuscripts, the Thomason Collection of pamphlets published during the Civil War and Commonwealth, and the 108 volumes of the Classified Catalogue of Manuscripts.

A wide selection of more than fifteen hundred manuscripts from the Bodleian and Oxford College libraries, and more than three thousand volumes of Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Urdu, and other manuscripts from the Cambridge University libraries comprise part

of the list. Many of the more important manuscript collections owned by noble families or by smaller libraries have been scheduled for copying as well, but the filming has been postponed until work is finished on the larger collections. In addition a carefully selected list of illuminated manuscripts has been reserved for filming in full color. The first frames of this color series are now in the United States and appear extremely successful.

Some concept of the size of the project can be had from the fact that the thirty-one lists ordered to date, out of a total of forty contemplated, comprise approximately 25,000,000 pages.

The microfilm technique is still somewhat new in England, and although University Microfilms had cameras and operators there, it was necessary to obtain addition technicians and to educate the custodians of libraries in the aims of the project and the uses of the film. The shortage of skilled labor in England is severe. Since a knowledge of manuscripts was desirable, women with such experience have been employed with great success. Too much cannot be said in praise of those who have done so well despite the handicaps of unfamiliar equipment and a strange technique. Though the work progressed somewhat slowly at first, it has constantly gained speed: in 1941, 162,280 pages were copied; in 1942, 706,150 pages; and in 1943 through August, 670,000 pages.

Each microfilm carries as the first exposure a title card giving the name of the manuscript, the call or catalogue number of the library owning the manuscript, the condition of the original, the library in which the original is deposited, the order number of the manuscript, and in some instances the date. When the manuscript has been listed in a published catalogue, *i.e.* the British Museum Catalogue, or the Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, that number is given also. It is felt that this information is sufficient to identify the manuscript.

It is planned to catalogue these films and to publish lists of holdings. Sufficient information will be given so that a scholar desiring to use any of these films will be able to obtain positive copies from the Library of Congress at a very reasonable rate, simply by giving the identifying information given in these booklets. Thus for the first time American scholars will have easy access in the United States to a well-rounded and complete collection of manuscript material.

As would naturally be expected, the English librarians very properly raised certain questions regarding the wholesale copying of their

manuscript collections. Recognizing as they did the importance and necessity of preserving and protecting them against possible loss,² they still were somewhat hesitant to grant permission for wholesale copying by a procedure which would readily allow duplication in another country. Therefore it was agreed that there should be certain restrictions upon the use of this film; the film could be freely used for research purposes or quotation, but if the manuscript was to be edited or the film reproduced and published in facsimile or in type, the permission of the owning library must be obtained. This seems a perfectly reasonable stipulation and was readily agreed to.

Enough cannot be said in praise of the splendid co-operation of the librarians whose collections are being copied. While their collections have been protected by copying, the work has placed an increased burden on a staff already greatly reduced by war demands. In many instances the manuscripts had to be brought from places of safety for copying, or unusual arrangements made to locate the cameras in evacuation depositories. In spite of these difficulties there has been a ready acknowledgment of the importance of the project and an eagerness to get on with it. Credit, too, must be given to Mr. Esdaile whose unfailing attention to the arrangements and details of the work has contributed much to the success of the project.

It will be seen that we have really made but a small beginning on the total program. We hope that the work can be continued and expanded after the war to include not only English libraries but libraries of other countries as well—Europe, Asia, and South America. In this way we will gradually assemble the materials for research and make them available to American scholars. While we realize that the microfilm copy does not in many respects serve as adequately as does the original, in a great majority of cases it is adequate. There is further reassurance in the fact that there exist copies of these unique, irreplaceable manuscripts in a form which makes possible additional duplication, should the need arise.

EUGENE B. POWER

Ann Arbor, Michigan

² It was not possible for many of the libraries to evacuate all of their holdings immediately at the beginning of bombing. In fact certain of the libraries still have not evacuated many of their collections due to the physical impossibility of finding safe places in the country and the task of packing and transporting them.

THE CONSOLIDATION OF FILES

THE creation of consolidated subject files from originally arranged chronological files, files of small administrative units, or indifferently put together files violates the primary precepts of archival economy. The principle of provenance is assailed. *Respect des fonds* is disturbed. The integrity of the files is destroyed. Everything is wrong, except that often for the first time the files can be used.

Casting aside the archival bromides that promptly rise to mind in response to the heresy suggested by the consolidation of completed files, one may reflect that, after all, it is precisely the consolidation which preserves the records for archival use and prevents their decay and disuse. Nevertheless, consolidation is no panacea for the restoration of disordered records to a workable condition, and the advantages and disadvantages of such rearrangement should be weighed carefully before it is undertaken.

The purpose of consolidation is to bring together related records of an agency which may be scattered widely among small files of its various executives and administrative divisions. The effect is not only to telescope the place element but to telescope the time element by bringing together related records theretofore separated by date levels in filing. Consolidation can best be made of completed files, preferably of sort duration, within one agency. Usually, when the original files are in a recognizable form or when a usable system can be restored or instituted, the identity of those files should be preserved. Likewise, files which are indexed adequately need not suffer the ignominy of rearrangement. It is principally records which have suffered through many administrative metamorphoses and handlings by various file clerks with no clear-cut filing system in mind that lend themselves to consolidation. In such cases, almost any understandable arrangement would be an improvement.

It is axiomatic that the principal requests for material in most noncurrent or relatively inactive general files are from the subject viewpoint. For such requests, nothing could be handier than a consolidated subject file. On the other hand, there are requests for material by name of the correspondent, by office, or by date. These requests are more difficult to locate, though, of course, finding them may not have been much simpler in the original file. The chief objection to consolidated files, however, seems to be the difficulty in

tracing through a particular transaction. Often a letter or report mentioning previous correspondence or inferring subsequent action is found in the subject file with no indication of where the associated material may be found. It is possible that this material may not have been filed or that the transaction was never completed, but, since the entire file is not together in one place, the question of its existence becomes the more tantalizing. A distinct advantage of consolidation, on the other hand, is that the searcher is assured that all the material on a certain subject has been brought together in one place, and there is no question that the file of some official, presumably having no authority over the subject but who may somehow have figured in the transaction, may have been ignored in the search. Another disadvantage of consolidation is that many records are left unidentified. Carbon copies of letters and memoranda, sometimes even originals, may be left undated or with no indication of their source and authorship, thus leaving a serious impediment in the tracing of administrative history and procedure.

Some experiments by the War Department with the consolidation of files offer examples of the pros and cons of the subject. One is the Letters Received file of the Quartermaster General's Office of the War Department, extending from 1800 to 1894, which was consolidated into a subject file by the clerks in that office some time after the system of filing was changed in that year. The records were originally arranged chronologically by year, thereunder by the initial letter of the name or office of the writer of the letter, thereunder chronologically by date of receipt of letter. There was no attempt at indexing the material until a subject index for each year was begun in June, 1862. During the Civil War period and until 1870, the office was broken down by numbered divisions, each with its own set of letters received books, endorsement books, letters sent books, and document files; from 1871 to 1883, there was a separate series of letters received from officers, agents, and employees of the Quartermaster Corps, and a letters received series from departments of the government and other bureaus of the War Department; there was a separate Transportation Branch, 1871-1889, which succeeded the 4th Division, River and Rail Transportation, 1865-1870; and during the period 1884 to 1889, the office was reorganized into lettered branches, each with its own files. Moreover, separate charter books were kept to record material concerning the chartering of vessels by the Quartermaster Corps.

Doubtless it was this administrative confusion in the files which caused the clerks in the office to consolidate the records into a single subject file to meet their needs in servicing the records. The result was three separate files: the subject file; a vessel file arranged alphabetically by name of vessel; and a residue file left in the original arrangement, evidently the remainder of the main file of the office, as the subsidiary division document files have disappeared. It is believed that the original intention was to include all the material in either the subject or the vessel file but that the letters which readily lent themselves to subject grouping were first consolidated and the rest were left for later reflective consideration, which never came about. It is quite possible though, that one of the old specters of consolidation simply reared its ugly head and was not solved: some records do not conform to integration on a subject level. Such division of filing is unsatisfactory, of course, because both files are left incomplete and consequently have lost a certain degree of effectiveness. Probably this residue would have eventually been intercalated into the main file if the original plans had been completed. Rarely in such cases are the residual records so dissimilar that some homogeneous filing system or integration with the consolidation scheme could not be worked out.

Consolidation was not a new scheme among War Department filing systems. Within the chronologically arranged files of the Adjutant General's Office and the Secretary of War's Office, records relating to a particular subject or person had been consolidated under the number assigned to one of the records in the collection since about the 1850's. The policy of consolidating related files under one number became widely used from the 1870's until the adoption of the subject decimal filing system in 1917 (1913 in the case of the Secretary of War's files). The files of the Adjutant General's Office relating to the Mexican War, the Indian wars, Custer's battle of the Little Big Horn, the Boxer Rebellion, army experiments with bicycles, the occupation of Vera Cruz, and many other such subjects as well as files relating to the career of a single officer were brought together in this manner. Such consolidation was not confined to the main files of the office but cut across administrative boundaries to include associated records from the files of the subdivisions of the office and the files of the geographical commands of the army. Considerable cross referencing was involved in superimposing consolidation on a strict system of assigning numbers in sequence to letters by

date of receipt (1890-1917) or the formerly used system of arrangement under each year by initial letter of the surname of the writer or his office, thereunder numerically by date of receipt of letter. Consolidation was made by the clerks who had had to withdraw all the records on a subject or person to save themselves the trouble of ever having to repeat that laborious operation and who therefore tied together the related records as one group and made appropriate references in the files and in the indexes and letters received books to the consolidated filing place.

Another ambitious project in consolidation was the first World War records of the Quartermaster General's Office, July 1, 1917, to roughly 1922. This file comprises some ten thousand cubic feet of the records of the main office and its subdivisions. It is arranged by the War Department decimal classification scheme with an additional breakdown known only to the classifiers and to the deity, without benefit of index. There are cross references—sheaves of them. Their bulk and multitude serves only to further confuse and confound the searcher. Successful searches have been made in this file, but skill had little to do with it. It is useless to say that consolidation ruined these records. The original files must have been in such a condition that a rearrangement was deemed necessary. What ruined this file was the failure to take advantage of the opportunity to weed out countless duplicates, printed material easily available elsewhere, and obsolete memoranda and letters of transmittal; the lack of skilled personnel—contrary to most business and government personnel classifications, subject and classified filing is a highly technical job, demanding high-grade intelligence and aptitude as well as technique; the lack of a finding medium, even a copy of the amplified classification scheme. This file offers a perfect example of the fact that an index to a classification scheme—the printed War Department code—is no index to the material in the file. Indeed one of the chief advantages of consolidation should be that a static file, consisting of records of permanent or relatively permanent historical and administrative significance, lends itself to adequate indexing.

A more notable example of consolidation is the file of the War Industries Board of the last war. In 1919, when the records of that discontinued agency were placed under the custody of the Council of National Defense, Miss Adelaide R. Hasse was employed to adapt the haphazard files created by a war-time agency with more important and pressing things to do than bother about its files to the necessities

of post-war study and analysis. The records were transferred to the War Department by an Executive Order of April 21, 1921, but the consolidation project was continued. Miss Hasse's qualifications for the job included her former positions as librarian of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, where she devised the document classification scheme and prepared the first checklist of government documents, and as chief of the Department of Government Documents and later the Economics Division of the New York Public Library, as well as her work as compiler of the index of U. S. documents relating to foreign affairs and indexes to economic material in state documents. Definitely this was not to be a file clerk's affair. Miss Hasse was confronted with the task of organizing the files of over eighty units and sections of the War Industries Board, which were arranged without any standard or uniform system of filing, into a unified scheme which could be used for studies of various phases of industrial mobilization for war by the Army Industrial College, Congressional committees, the Planning Branch of the General Staff which was laying plans for the next war, and individual historians and economists. Her decision was to arrange the files into three major categories: administrative, technical or commodity, and company. Within each category, the material was grouped alphabetically by organization or subject. The general arrangement was as follows. The administrative file was divided into two sections: the War Industries Board as a subdivision of the Council of National Defense, July 28, 1917, to May 28, 1918; and the War Industries Board as an independent organization, May 28, 1918, to its termination on December 31, 1918, with its short period of liquidation in 1919. General administrative records were filed first, followed by files of top officials, and then the operational divisions and committees in alphabetical order. A similar project was undertaken in the files of the Council of National Defense. In the technical or commodity file of the War Industries Board, Miss Hasse encountered a situation which is one of the principal problems of consolidation within the files of one agency. In gathering together records reflecting a complete picture of certain subjects, such as priorities, price fixing, contracts, and facilities, she naturally had to begin with the predecessor agencies to the War Industries Board which had considered those subjects. Therefore, she had to withdraw certain pertinent records from the files of the Council of National Defense and its advisory commission, which administered or rather encouraged war produc-

tion before the creation of the War Industries Board. The company file is less successful than the other two files, because the material filed there consists of priority certificates and routine correspondence having little if any historical significance. No index was made to the files, but cross references were included in the files, and a card list of the subjects used, with reference to related subjects and references from subjects not used, was compiled. Miss Hasse also made considerable use of filing duplicate material in several places.

The dissatisfaction which has been expressed regarding this arrangement has been due largely to extraneous causes over which Miss Hasse had little control. In the first place, Miss Hasse left to accept another position in 1923, shortly before the file was completed, so that the consolidation was never finished. Secondly, records selected for special study by legislative committees and by the War Department were extracted from the files and not returned in time for inclusion in the consolidated files, so that there exist several small files on certain subjects like copper, nickel, lead, and zinc, and a small consolidated file on most of the War Industries Board policies, which are now kept as separate series in addition to the material on those subjects in the technical or commodity file. In the third place, in the various moves and handlings the files have suffered, and apparently intended chronological arrangement under a subject or a subdivision thereof was thrown awry, aided materially by the disintegration of the poor quality folders. For the rest, the disadvantages stated above as generally standard with all such consolidations apply to this file as well.

Experience in servicing requests on this file at the beginning of this war, when frantic efforts were being made to draw on the experience of the last war—the fruits of such search being thereupon ignored, has in the main proved the soundness of the original plan of consolidation. The calls were by subject or about the organization and functions of an administrative unit, and, while it was difficult for the searcher to trace a particular action, experience in finding records in the files of the Council of National Defense, which were left practically intact, proves the inadequacy of the administrative approach. In the latter case, a search on, for example, early plans for food control prior to the establishment of the Food Administration takes one to the records of the chairman of the council, the chairman of the advisory commission, the secretary's file, and on to the divisional files *ad infinitum*, whereas the subject can be found in the consolidated

War Industries Board files by looking in two places—in the technical or commodity file under Food and under U. S. Food Administration. If it cannot be found there, one can be sure that Mr. Hoover carried it off to the Hoover War Library. The consolidated file does present a few foibles which the person servicing it must know. For example, material on steel can be found under Steel, Iron and Steel, and American Iron and Steel Institute. But this is a difficulty encountered in any alphabetical subject file, and even its antidote, a classified subject file, is not free from the vagaries of the many facets in the presentation of material on a subject. There is also some duplication in searching the main consolidated subject file and the small consolidated subject file on policy matters which was set aside for study by the Army Industrial College, though, of course, this was doubtless accomplished without Miss Hasse's consent or approval. Another difficult feature is the inclusion of much routine administrative material, such as priority certificates, blank forms, and much printed material accumulated from other sources, such as Department of Commerce reports, census of manufactures, *etc.*, which nowadays would automatically be put on a disposal list or otherwise eliminated as useless papers.

If one views files as research tools and not as phenomena handed down from the past to be cherished as such, consolidation in the cases cited above was not so much a violation of provenance as a change in the function of the files from administrative to historical. Thus, in becoming noncurrent, the files became only relatively inactive, and the purpose for which they were used differed accordingly. On that ground it can be argued that consolidation was justified. Consolidation, in fact, increased the activity of the files. That the results were not always satisfactory is not so much a condemnation of the theory as of the manner in which it was carried out.

The transition from administrative to historical use demands that changes in the filing system to accommodate and facilitate the new use be much more carefully and expertly carried out than in the original instance. The file can now be considered as a complete unit with full knowledge of the intended use and therefore escapes the tentativeness of beginning files, which must respond to a changing or expanding administrative organization. Particularly if consolidation is to be by subject, extreme care and thoughtfulness as well as sound technique must accompany the choice of subjects. Classification and indexing also require considerable technical facility, as well as

familiarity with the material content and an appreciation of the attitudes of potential researchers. It requires the best efforts of a combination archivist-historian-librarian-file clerk to do the job, and of all these techniques in equal parts.

One of the best testimonials to the efficacy of consolidated files is the modern system of central files, which, with adequate weeding, should preclude the need for any subsequent rearrangement. It is highly possible that some of the records of this war, conceived in haste and indirection, may eventually be collected for the use of post-war analysts of the war mobilization picture by consolidation. It should be expected that by this time the mechanical and rectifiable mistakes of the past will be avoided, that the advantages and disadvantages of consolidation be carefully weighed before the task is undertaken, and that proper elimination of useless papers and adequate finding mediums accompany the creation of order out of chaos and a comprehensive file out of numberless small files.

MARIE CHARLOTTE STARK

Historical Records Section, War Production Board

THE BRITISH HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

THE establishment of the Royal Commission for Historical Manuscripts in 1869 was an outgrowth of the concern for public records which had reached a climax only a few years earlier. As far back as 1661, William Prynne was appointed by Charles II to care for the public records in the Tower of London. Prynne described them as a "confused chaos, under corroding, putrifying cobwebs, dust and filth. . . ." In attempting to rescue them he employed successively "old clerks, soldiers and women," but all abandoned the job as too dirty and unwholesome. Prynne and his clerk cleaned and sorted them. He found, as he had expected, "many rare ancient precious pearls and golden records."¹

Nevertheless, by 1800 the condition of the records was deplorable again, and a Record Commission was appointed for their custody and management. It was composed of men of distinction, was liberally supported, and it published various important documents. In spite of its work, the commission could not cope with the scattered records and unsuitable depositories. Of the latter, one was a room in the Tower of London over a gunpowder vault and next to a steam pipe passage; others were cellars and stables. The agitation aroused by the commission led to passage of the Public Records Act in 1838. The care and administration of the records was restored to the Master or Keeper of the Rolls, in conjunction with the Treasury department, with enlarged powers. The Master of the Rolls had been in the fifteenth century a clerk and keeper of the records. By the nineteenth century he had become one of the three Supreme Justices of England, still bearing the same title but no longer having charge of the public records, until they were returned to him in 1838. A new building, the far-famed Public Record Office in Chancery Lane, was begun in 1851. It contained rooms for research investigators and copyists, in contrast to the earlier lack of accommodations for and indifference to scholars.

Public records being well in hand, thought turned to the wealth of manuscript material in Great Britain still in private hands. In 1859 a petition to the prime minister was drawn up and signed by

¹ "Report of the Council," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 1880-1881 (Worcester, 1882), N.S., I, 24-25.

sixty well-known noblemen, scholars, and others, asking that a commission be appointed to investigate means of making these private collections accessible. Not until ten years later, however, was a warrant issued by Queen Victoria, dated April 2, 1869, establishing a Royal Commission for Historical Manuscripts.

The warrant from the Queen began: "Whereas it has been represented unto us that there are belonging to many Institutions and private Families various Collections of Manuscripts and Papers of general public interest, a knowledge of which would be of great utility in the illustration of History, Constitutional Law, Science, and general Literature, and that in some cases these Papers are liable to be lost or obliterated," a commission was appointed "to make inquiry as to the places in which such Papers and Manuscripts are deposited, and for any of the purposes herein mentioned . . . authorize you, with the consent of the owners of such Manuscripts, to make abstracts and calendars of such Manuscripts. . . ."²

The commission was to be composed of five noblemen and four commoners, with the Master of the Rolls as chairman, the Deputy Keeper of the Records a member, and three to constitute a quorum. The appointive members were persons "calculated to recommend the advances to be made to owners of manuscripts who might possibly have looked askance at any investigation of private papers . . . some of whom were intimately concerned with historical research." On the first commission was Baron Romilly, Master of the Rolls, and Thomas Duffus Hardy, Deputy Keeper, who had already achieved a reputation by their work at the Public Record Office. Others were the Earl Stanhope, historian and member of the Society of Antiquaries, Sir William Stirling Maxwell, historian and antiquarian, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, biographer and student of the Napoleonic period, Sir George Dasent, a Scandinavian-English scholar, President C. W. Russell of the College of St. Patrick, Maynooth, Ireland, the Earl of Airlie, and the Marquess of Salisbury. Two additional members were appointed the same year: the Bishop of Limerick and Baron Talbot de Malahide, president of the Archaeological Society and member of the Royal Irish Academy. Eventually the commission numbered fourteen.

Curiously enough, the commission was intended to be temporary

² *First Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (London, 1874), iii, iv.

at the time, one suggestion being for five years. Its success was so marked, however, that it was continued and increased.

In beginning its work, the commission, through a secretary, sent out a circular enclosing the queen's warrant to owners of manuscript collections in England, Scotland, and Ireland, stating carefully that "the object of the Commission is solely the discovery of unknown Historical and Literary materials, and in all their proceedings the Commissioners will direct their attention to that object exclusively."³ A chronological list or brief calendar would be drawn up, the original to be deposited at the Public Record Office, not to be made public without the owner's consent. The commissioners would give advice, if so requested, on repairing and preserving the papers. These circulars brought a gratifying response of many invitations to examine collections. The mass of material was overwhelming, so much so that, with the two inspectors (later increased to five) who were to do the actual visiting, the commission decided to make a preliminary survey and to catalogue only enough manuscripts to suggest the content of some of the more important collections.

Accordingly, the first *Report*, 1870, was a partial list of the collections brought to the attention of the commissioners, followed by an appendix containing excerpts and lists of letters from sixty private and municipal repositories visited. The investigators had uncovered, for instance, seventy-two original letters of Mary, Queen of Scotland, material on some of the least known periods of English history, and many collections whose existence had not been known till then.

One of the inspectors, in the course of his work, found a key labeled "Key to old writings over stable" and used it, discovering among the dust and rats a most valuable collection which was at once cleaned, mounted, and bound at no little expense (the owner's, of course). This incident was publicized, and a later secretary said that it led to investigations by owners and in many cases to proper care of neglected manuscripts. The Southampton municipal records were found in disorder; but the visit of the inspector stimulated the authorities to have them arranged at their own expense.

The first year's work, the commissioners felt, had uncovered valuable historical material, given owners a definite stimulus to look after their manuscripts, and set a new standard of value on what was too often thought to be rubbish.

³ *Ibid.*, 133.

The second *Report*, 1871, stated that the first had created "great public interest." Three editions of it had been printed, 1,625 copies, and presented to members of Parliament and to all who had assisted the commission. The commissioners expressed themselves as gratified (and obviously relieved) at the response of the public, who had proven eager to help. An inspector for Scotland was added the second year. Already some collections had been given or sold to the Public Record Office, British Museum, and Bodleian Library. The commissioners suggested that funds be made available for copying the most valuable documents as a safeguard against possible accidents to the originals.

By the time the third *Report* appeared in 1872, the commission was soundly established. Public opinion and private co-operation was favorable beyond its hopes, and more work was in sight than could be done for several years.

Successive reports of the commissioners were always addressed to the sovereign. The first nine contained the reports of the inspectors in the appendices. Although the reports of the commissioners grew longer as the years passed, the real meat for the research worker was in the inspectors' reports on the particular collections. At first the commissioners reported annually, then at longer and more irregular intervals. From the tenth to fifteenth published *Report*, the appraisals of the inspectors were issued as separate volumes, although each was still called an appendix and was somewhat arbitrarily attributed to a commission report. By this time the system of numbering had grown complicated as the calendars of some collections ran to more than one volume appearing in different *Reports*. To simplify matters, after the fifteenth *Report*, the calendars appeared under the name of the collection, with a series called *Various Collections* taking care of the shorter calendars.

The *Reports* were issued as parliamentary blue books, folio size in double columns, paper covered, and costing three-pence for each 64 pages, the price by law for blue books. With the tenth *Report*, they changed to octavo size as being more convenient. At the request of the commissioners in 1897, they were changed to Stationery Office publications, still octavo, paper covered.

The first circular issued by the commission, and the second sent a year later, also said: "In no instance will any MS. be removed from the owner's residence without his request or consent, but if for convenience the commissioners be intrusted with any MSS., they will be

deposited in the Public Record Office, and be treated with the same care as if they formed part of the Public Muniments. . . . The costs of the inspections, reports, and calendars, and the conveyance of documents, will be defrayed at the public expense without any charge to owners."⁴ In practice it was soon found convenient to make a selection of material and have it sent to the Public Record Office in London or Dublin, or the General Registry Office in Edinburgh, where the inspectors could work with greater regularity than in private houses.

Some of the rules for calendaring laid down by the Master of the Rolls were:

1st. All formal and official documents, such as letters of credence, warrants, grants, and the like, should be described as briefly as possible.

2nd. Letters and documents referring to one subject only should be catalogued as briefly as is consistent with correctness. But when they contain miscellaneous news, such a description should be given as will enable a reader to form an adequate notion of the variety of their contents. . . .

7th. Where letters are endorsed by the receivers and the date of their delivery specified, those endorsements are to be recorded.

8th. The number of written pages of each document is to be specified, as security for its integrity, and that readers may know what proportion the abstract bears to the original. . . .

10th. Where documents have been printed, a reference should be given to the publication.

11th. Each series is to be chronological. . . .⁵

Instruction to the inspectors also included emphasis on privacy and, to insure it further, all notes made by them in the course of their employment were the property of the commission. Years later a one-time inspector said of his work: "I determined, in the preparation of my list, to aim less at conciseness than at an explanatory amplitude that should satisfy, whilst provoking, the peruser's curiosity."⁶

The inspectors, "on whose knowledge and discretion great reliance was necessarily placed," worked under the guidance of the commissioners and secretary. In the course of the years, many were men of reputation and ability. Several were appointed commissioners later.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ W. C. Ford, "On Calendaring Manuscripts," *Bibliographical Society of America, Papers*, 1909 (Cedar Rapids, 1910), IV, 56.

⁶ R. A. Roberts, "Concerning the Historical Manuscripts Commission," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1910 (London, 1910), Third Series, IV, 73.

They played an anonymous role at first, except for occasional signed notes in the appendices. As the calendar of an individual collection grew longer, the commissioners might mention which inspector was working on it. In 1929, by a vote of the commissioners, the name of the inspector was to appear on the title page of future calendars.

Richard Arthur Roberts, inspector, secretary to the commission, and later a commissioner, seems to have been the only one who has written much about the body's work. He mentioned that the preliminary survey period lasted until about 1876, with more than 420 collections examined. Later on the work, which showed signs of increasing after forty years rather than decreasing, became less extensive and more intensive. Better methods of working developed; all material was taken to the Public Record Office for examination, and a more uniform style took shape. The aim was "to do what was done adequately and exhaustively for the purposes of the student."⁷ In consequence, a number of the earlier reports were amplified and issued again.

The commission worked along with apparently quite slender funds. As in all royal commissions, the members gave their services gratuitously, but "where they involved any great deal of professional skill compensation was allowed for time and labor." The second *Report* revealed that the commission was allowed £1000 for the first year's work and was granted £1200 for the second. The next definite mention of finances was not made until 1914, when civil budgets were being pared because of war. The commission suspended all new work as well as some printing already in progress. Only volumes advanced in printing and calendars in progress on collections deposited by owners in the Public Record Office, which could not be held indefinitely, were finished. The amount spent in the fiscal year 1914-1915 was £1800. This sum diminished to £200 for the year 1919-1920. By 1923-1924 it had risen to only £700. In 1926 the commission urged that £1000 a year increase would be of real benefit to hurry the work before the breaking-up of private libraries and the sale of estates put the manuscript collections out of reach. The war was now taking its toll of wages through increased taxes.

Certain reports deserve particular mention. The only collection reported on outside the British Isles is described in the first *Report*. Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, one of the original commissioners, while

⁷ *Ibid.*, 80.

traveling in Germany stopped to see the material relating to England in the university library at Heidelberg and rendered an inspector's report on it.

The reports on the manuscripts of the House of Lords began with the first meeting of the commissioners, when the papers were unexpectedly brought to their attention. They had been discovered when the clerk of Parliament gave a scholar permission to search for material. Through an old officer who had saved the papers from the fire of 1834, this scholar located twelve rooms full of papers in the basement of the House, on river level but fortunately dry. Realizing the value of what he had found, he reported to the clerk. The commission supervised an investigator appointed by the clerk. The old records proved to be an amazingly rich storehouse of information. At the request of the commission, the treasury provided funds for the sorting, arranging, and calendaring of the manuscripts. The work continued under the general supervision of the commission until 1896, when at their request it was transferred to the House of Lords. The reports continued to be published by the commission.

Benjamin Franklin Stevens, well known to American scholars for the transcripts he edited and the index he compiled which is now in the Library of Congress, calendared that section of the Earl of Dartmouth's manuscripts which appears in the fourteenth *Report*, Part X (1895). He also did much of the work on the four volumes of *American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution*, published by the commission (1904-1909).

Of special interest are those calendared collections that have come to the United States in recent years. Part of the Lansdowne manuscripts listed in the third, fifth, and sixth *Reports* are now owned by the William L. Clements Library of the University of Michigan, where they are known as the Shelburne Papers. This library likewise has most of the manuscripts formerly belonging to Mrs. Stopford-Sackville and calendared in the *Ninth Report*, Part III.⁸ They are the papers of Lord George Germain. The William Knox Papers once owned by Capt. Howard Vicente Knox and calendared in *Manuscripts in Various Collections*, Volume VI, are also in the possession of the Clements Library.

The Royal Institution sold its American papers in 1930 to Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach of Philadelphia, who in turn sold them to John

⁸ Revised and reissued in 1904 and 1910.

D. Rockefeller, Jr., for Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., where they may be found now. They are the papers of Sir Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester, saved by Maurice Morgann, his secretary.

The present war, although affecting the work of the commission, has not caused it to be suspended. The latest reports to be published were four volumes in 1942 on the collections of Lord Polwarth, the Earl of Lindsey, Robert Graham, and Maj. Gen. Lord Sackville. In December, 1942, the commission issued a leaflet seeking the present location of various collections which have changed hands and incidentally offering a summary of its work. The Royal Commission for Historical Manuscripts has published during its seventy-three years reports of "varying degrees of completeness" on 628 collections: 213 were archives of boroughs, dioceses, colleges, endowed charities, and other corporate bodies; and 415 were owned by private families.

Besides the direct results of the commission's work, its influence has prompted many gifts, loans, and purchases of manuscript collections to British institutions. The commission's efforts also have inspired societies and individuals with an interest in caring for old records. When the commission's work will terminate, no one dares say.

Today the commission numbers seventeen members and they are: Baron Greene, chairman, R. L. Atkinson, secretary, the Earl of Ancaster, Viscount Cranborne, Lord Herbert, Viscount Sandon, Lord Wright, Lord Chief Justice MacKinnon, Sir Frederick Kenyon, Professor A. F. Pollard, R. A. Roberts, D. A. Chart, C. T. Flower, S. C. Ratcliff, William Angus, K. W. M. Pickthorn, and Professor E. F. Jacob.⁹

JESSIE E. BECKHAM

Grand Rapids, Michigan

⁹ Whitaker's *Almanac*, 1943.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

RICHARD G. WOOD, Editor

The National Archives, Washington, D.C.

A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms, with a Selection of Terms in Related Fields, prepared under the direction of the Committee on Library Terminology of the American Library Association by Elizabeth H. Thompson. (Chicago. American Library Association, 1943. Pp. viii, 159. Cloth \$3.50.)

The subtitle of this book, "with a selection of terms in related fields," shows its real value to the archivist. The interest of members of this group is centered, not on the technical terms of library practice, but on those dealing with archives, maps, and films, and in these respects the book is of value to them. The definitions of archival terms are excellent, and should be of great value to everyone, both in and out of the archival profession, in providing definite and clear statements of what have been to many people vague and shadowy terms. We only wish that there were more of them.

The definitions of terms relating to maps and microphotography, especially the latter, are very good. Here we have, for the first time, a group of terms clearly defined in such language that those who are not acquainted with the technical jargon of photography can understand.

The technical library terms, interesting to this reviewer because he is a trained librarian as well as an archivist, are very well done, clear and succinct. The mere perusal of the glossary brings home forcibly the progress that has been made in library science in the last decade.

One criticism, and only one, can be made of the glossary, and that is the definition of the terms used in binding, and even that is tempered by the realization that space is at a premium in these times. The definitions of the different types of sewing could be made much clearer if they were accompanied by simple diagrams. It is difficult for one not too familiar with the binding process to grasp the different types of sewing and their particular virtues. This is, however, a very minor matter, and Mr. Feipel is to be congratulated on his contribution to the *Glossary*. The book is a distinct contribution to both library and archival science and should be of value to both librarians and archivists, and especially to those persons whose duties are a combination of both professions.

EDWARD F. ROWSE

The National Archives

An Experiment in the Retention and Preservation of Corporate Records, by Carl H. McKenzie. Supplement to the Business Historical Society *Bulletin* for February, 1943. (Boston. Baker Library, 1943. Pp. 23.)

If other alumni of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration carry with them into their business careers as intelligent an interest in business records and their management as has the author of this pamphlet, we may expect them in time, as they rise to positions of responsibility, to exert a real influence upon the standards of record administration in the business world. The author, who is secretary-treasurer of the Pennsylvania Telephone Corporation, here presents a case study based upon his actual experience in grappling with the record problems of his own corporation. It is presented, according to the editor's note, as a kind of supplement to Ralph M. Hower's pamphlet, *The Preservation of Business Records*, now in its fourth printing.

In his search for "tried or suggested methods and procedures," Mr. McKenzie was obliged to turn to writings on public archives, there being "no constructive material available indicative that private business had given serious consideration to the problem." The experience of archivists, "even if somewhat different in scope, was found helpful and instructive." He notes significantly that the regulations of governmental regulatory agencies with respect to the keeping of records by many businesses affected with a public interest, including his own, "contain positive retention limitations for certain records but are indefinite as to the requirements for those records which a business may wish to retain for informational or historical purposes." He adds further that "historical value demands serious thought, not only for potential future advertising purposes and sentimental reasons but also from the viewpoint of successor managements."

The necessary preliminary survey revealed that "decentralized storage had been permitted to flourish throughout the organization." Mergers and consolidations had "left an aftermath of scattered, disconnected, or incomplete records, apparently forgotten once the matter of immediate importance had been concluded." It was decided that "centralization must be insisted upon so that an efficient and economical approach could be undertaken toward ultimate standardization." The records were therefore assembled, examined, and sorted. The useless records were eliminated. Those to be permanently retained were flattened, repaired, classified, and indexed, and filed systematically in a large vault. Retention and disposal schedules were drawn up on the basis of this work. The description of the classification and indexing procedures followed leaves one with the impression that they are more elaborate than necessary, and the vault arrangement described seems to lack flexibility. One would have to visit the depository, however, to fully understand and pass judgment upon these matters. Whatever one's doubts as to certain details of procedure, this is an intelligent and thought-provoking pamphlet that should be in the

hands of all practicing business archivists and others interested in the management of the records of business firms.

OLIVER W. HOLMES

The National Archives

The Administration of Current Records in Italian Public Agencies, by Ernst Posner. The National Archives, *Records Administration Circular* No. 5 (November, 1943). Pp. 13. Multilithed.

The study of the administration of current records in a foreign country, as the author points out in his prefatory paragraphs, should be done by personal observation; and whenever that is impossible, it should be based on realistic descriptions of prevailing practices and actual conditions. If these methods are unavailable, then filing manuals and regulatory documents constitute the only types of source material that can be used. Little recent material, even of the last category, was available in this country for the author. Notwithstanding this the writer, a former archivist in the Privy State Archives in Berlin and now adjunct professor of archival administration at the American University, has given in a few pages a glimpse of the organization for and procedures of paper work prescribed for Italian public agencies at the beginning of the twentieth century and which are known to have been maintained in force down to the early thirties. The registering, classifying, and arranging of an agency's records, which are major processes in records administration proper, are discussed. There are also notes on the organizational structure of the government at various levels and of some of the offices and officers responsible for records administration matters. The preparation of this paper for the assistance of those engaged in the administration of occupied territories, at the suggestion of the archivist of the United States, demonstrates that archives can be made to meet the exigencies of the hour.

GASTON LITTON

The National Archives

NEWS NOTES

KARL L. TREVER, Editor

The National Archives, Washington, D.C.

THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

Report of the Secretary

November 15, 1943

Article 2 of the constitution of this Society declares that

The objects of The Society of American Archivists shall be to promote sound principles of archival economy and to facilitate co-operation among archivists and archival agencies.

Article 3 makes eligible for membership archivists and "those . . . engaged in the custody or administration of . . . historical manuscripts or who, because of special experience or other qualifications, are recognized as competent in archival economy." You will recall that last year Dr. Connor in his presidential address spoke of his "Adventures as an Amateur Archivist." The modest tone of that title may well be echoed by the other members of our Society, whether we are archivists or custodians of historical manuscripts. While it may give us the comforting feeling that not too much should be expected of us, on the other hand it should make us realize that there is a long road ahead before we arrive. Seven years ago next December 30, we established this professional Society to develop a new profession in America through the efforts chiefly of historians and librarians interested in the problems of manuscript records and their modern prototypes. The founding and growth of the Society are ample evidence that keepers of archives and custodians of historical manuscripts have much in common; and it has been our endeavor to interpret the objects of the Society broadly in this respect. From the standpoint of terminology there is one difficulty. A custodian of archives is an archivist; but a custodian of manuscripts is only a custodian or curator or some such anomaly. I am reminded of the rhyme for X in the illustrated *Thackeray Alphabet*:

He who a picture on this sheet expects
Is disappointed, X is only X

However, in this year of Jefferson celebration we might adapt his political slogan to our purposes and declare: "We are all archivists, we are all manuscript custodians."

The report of the secretary offers an opportunity for annual stock-taking (indeed he is directed to do so by the constitution) and for surveying the activities of the Society in relation to prevailing problems and needs within its

sphere of interest. To what extent is it keeping pace with demands in these swiftly changing times, and equally important, leading the way with sound judgment and foresight? Whatever we may have accomplished during the past year and whatever we may do in the next is conditioned primarily by the progress of the war. It may be worth noting that this seventh annual meeting has been made possible by the grace of God, the good will of the Office of Defense Transportation, and not least the successes of our armed forces.

It is heartening to observe that our Society contributed substantially to preparations for the possible eventuality of war during the period of America's tenuous neutrality in 1940-1941; that specialists in archives and manuscripts have found much of their work closely related to the war effort; and that they have provided personnel for governmental war service directly in their own field. When one of our former presidents, Dr. Waldo G. Leland, addressed the Society on "The Archivist in Times of Emergency," he threw out a challenge that reached the ears of high officials in our government. When war came, the archivist was able to convince the government with little difficulty that he had an essential part to play in the administrative field. Nor should the cultural needs of civilian life be neglected, in spite of total war or, more accurately, because of it. Ideals and realities are closely intermingled during times of stress and the American people have seized avidly upon reinterpretations of the democratic way of life as well as upon war-time narratives, past and present. Thus, however much normal programs of research institutions have been modified or curtailed, the custodians of our cultural resources have labored to meet these demands of government officials and private researchers, professional and amateur. The collection and preservation of materials present special problems beyond the direct hazards of warfare in exposed areas; with the transfer of valuable staff members into the armed forces there are few persons available to train replacements; and, as the mills of research continue to grind out an abundance of fact and opinion, on which we desire to keep informed, shortage of paper is only one of many questions concerned with publication. In these matters our Society is necessarily interested and in most of them it has shown definite accomplishments. Moreover, it has ventured to anticipate some future needs which may be fulfilled, it is hoped, when peace has returned.

There are four ways in which the Society of American Archivists functions in order to carry out the broad objects which I quoted from its constitution at the beginning of this report. These means are (1) its annual meetings and occasional joint sessions with other associations; (2) its publications, chiefly *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*; (3) its committees appointed each year; and (4) its secretary's office, with which I shall include the actions of the council. I should like to review our activities under these four headings in relation to the question previously raised: To what extent are we keeping abreast of the times, to what degree are we setting the pace?

The programs of both the previous and present annual meetings have given

emphasis to several vital problems demanding wise solution not only because of war conditions but also as a safeguard for the future. Our earlier concern with the transfer of records to depositories for the primary purpose of adequate preservation has evolved into the broader, more intelligent conception of records administration, embracing their creation, filing, selection for disposal or transfer to archival custody, and their permanent preservation and use as archives. As the war has hastened the study of this problem in some of the states and especially in the federal government, so our Society has devoted considerable attention to it. One segment is the records of war administration which has served as an entering wedge to the whole field along with the projects preparing to write war histories based largely upon these records. This movement has been paralleled somewhat by the collection and preservation of war materials in the states and localities to insure a sounder basis in most areas (it is hoped) than was attained a generation ago for research and writing on the war period. These undertakings have been among the promotional activities of the Committee on Conservation of Cultural Resources on which this Society has been represented. Another subject of major interest is the administration of federal records outside the District of Columbia. Officials and scholars in the states as well as in the national capital are vitally concerned with the issue of centralization versus decentralization, of state or regional depositories for records representing overlapping jurisdictions as opposed to concentration of all of them in Washington. The solution of this question may be suspended for the duration and it merits further discussion by our members. Although the war has not yet been won and we are cautioned against our American propensity for over-optimism, I believe it is commendable that we are directing a considerable portion of our energy to post-war planning. Further evidence is at hand in the papers at this meeting on archival buildings and the anticipation of a stabilization program in relation to archival needs in the states and localities.

In establishing this archival profession we have been seriously engaged in the discussion of practice and theory, the outcome of daily experience by trial and error. The influence of American pragmatism is in evidence as we endeavor to agree upon principles. In asserting the individuality of his profession, however, with its peculiar problems, the archivist has been inclined sometimes to forget his relation to other guilds with which he might collaborate for mutual advantage. For several years the American Library Association's Committee on Archives and Libraries has held public sessions to discuss current problems. Many archivists concluded from the tenor of these meetings that they must assert their youthful independence to avoid being tied to the apron strings of an older profession. Nevertheless it is encouraging to note that discussion has by no means been abandoned; that, quite the contrary, Mr. Randolph Church's address on "The Relationship between Archival Agencies and Libraries" at the previous meeting of our Society has produced both light and heat on the

subject; and that it has been continued in our program this year. Mr. Church's paper contained some comments on personal manuscript collections offered to archives and the archivist's interest in them. The obverse of this situation, namely that the custodian of historical manuscripts inevitably finds archival materials among his collections, suggests again the advisability of our Society's giving due attention at its annual meetings to the manuscript field and its relations to archives. Another step in this direction is the Town Meeting this year, arranged as a joint session with the American Association for State and Local History.

One other point is suggested by our seventh annual program, in connection with the papers on the archives of Princeton University and of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad. These are excellent illustrations of special fields of records to which our Society may well devote increasing emphasis. They are indicative of institutions in the multiplicity of economic, intellectual, religious, and social pursuits in American life where mere preservation of records might be developed into archival administration. Here is a relatively unexploited field that falls appropriately within the province of our Society. The work of the Historical Records Survey has provided some evidence of its magnitude and opportunities. Is there any concrete approach to it? I should like to offer a suggestion later in connection with my comments on committee activities.

Our Society is best known and reaches its widest audience through the publication of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*. Subscribers to the journal provide an important and stable source of income and we deeply appreciate the subvention from the University of Illinois for the magazine since its inception in 1938. Likewise we have benefited from the high editorial standards and unflagging efforts of Professor Theodore C. Pease and his staff. The book reviews and shorter notices under the editorship of Messrs. Emmett J. Leahy and Edward F. Rowse present helpful comments and criticism. Many members contribute to the section on news notes so ably edited by Mr. Karl L. Trever, who has expanded this service to the point where it has become indispensable to those readers desiring to keep up to date on developments in the field. Many of the articles in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* are, quite properly, papers read at the annual meetings. That these articles are too exclusively such is a criticism that deserves consideration. That they should cover a wider variety of subjects pertaining to both archives and manuscript collections—historical and bibliographical articles, experiences of leading members of the profession, documents illustrating the evolution of archival and manuscript procedure, etc.—here is another pertinent comment. In his report as secretary last year, it will be recalled, Dr. Brooks pointed out that Professor Pease would like to see some means provided to yield a larger number and greater variety of articles submitted without solicitation. The editor and his advisory editorial board should be in a position to choose the best papers for

publication from a considerable number contributed. I am glad to report that a Committee on Archival Research was appointed during the past year with Mr. Herman Kahn as chairman and that the suggestions above are derived mainly from the correspondence of this committee. It is expected that during the coming year its members can work out a procedure to meet this problem satisfactorily to the advantage of the editor and his board, the members of the Society, and our reading public. We already have the benefit today of Professor Pease's paper on how "An Editor Looks at His Non-Contributors."

The October, 1943, issue of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* contains a bibliography of "Writings on Archives and Manuscripts, July, 1942-June, 1943," compiled by Karl L. Trever. This innovation in the activities of the Society is the product of a Committee on Writings, under the chairmanship of Mr. Trever, established some months ago. While the list is experimental in its form and content, it will undoubtedly meet the pressing need for a reference tool in this rapidly expanding field. The Committee endeavored to limit the list of publications strictly to those appearing during the twelve-month period indicated and the plan is to issue such a list annually.

The third important channel through which our Society functions is its committees. Their activities have suffered somewhat because war duties and responsibilities hold priority on the twenty-four hours per day allotted to each member, although it is generally true that the busiest persons are most dependable for results. Undoubtedly our Society is not unique in its experience that some chairmen find themselves doing too much of the work without benefit of aid from their colleagues. We may be assured that we are quite a normal group of human beings in this respect. However, the fruits of our committees' labors are substantial in many instances. It should be pointed out, moreover, that the formation of some committees was delayed in the course of correspondence and that the new secretary was groping his way with faltering steps as he endeavored to familiarize himself with past and current projects. Some committees have perennial tasks to perform; others are needed only as circumstances arise; and in view of my predecessor's observation last year that we have tended to have too many committees, some have been abolished or discontinued for the present.

In surveying the various fields of operations they may be classified as follows: (a) research and publication; (b) administration; (c) archival and manuscript techniques; (d) special collections of records; (e) promotional activities; and (f) planning and policy. A discussion of committee work under these general headings may serve to indicate to what extent the specific projects fit into the broader picture and to suggest where we might initiate new ventures. It is recognized that some of the fields overlap and that the outline is over-simplified.

In the category of research and publication the activities of the Committees on Archival Research and on Writings on Archives and Manuscripts have already been discussed. Both demonstrate the importance of bibliography; both

emphasize the interest of our profession in research as well as in administrative problems. The close kinship between archivists and historians, which Captain Jesse Douglas commented upon with precision in his address at our meeting last year, may well be reflected in the results of these committees' deliberations.

The Committee on Publication Policies of Archival Agencies has deemed it advisable to suspend its collection of data from archival institutions and manuscript depositories until after the war. In some instances it is found that publication has been held in abeyance for lack of adequate staff and printing materials. Furthermore, it is anticipated that post-war plans and revisions of policies would render obsolete any summary of present war-time conditions.

The field of administration is represented by the Committee on Records Administration which evolved from an earlier one on Reduction of Archival Material. War conditions, by augmenting the flood of current records, have intensified the problems of their administration but by so doing have played somewhat into the archivists' hands in the federal government. The chairman of the committee, Lieutenant Commander Emmett J. Leahy, and his co-workers Miss Helen L. Chatfield and Captain Wayne C. Grover, in their official connections with important bodies of federal records, are able to provide information and conclusions from first-hand experience. In turn the Society of American Archivists has promoted through the reports of the committee a widespread consideration of intelligent records administration by government agencies and of its relation to archival problems. It is hoped that the study of this urgent question can be continued with respect to federal records and extended into the state and local domains. Closely akin is the subject of administrative history, as yet in the early stages of development by the American political scientist and archivist. It may be noted that the *Handbook of Federal World War Agencies and Their Records, 1917-1921* (1943), published by the National Archives, was one of the projects recommended by this Society through its former Committee on the History and Organization of Government Emergency Activities.

Committees on archival and manuscript techniques have included from time to time those on microphotography, terminology, classification and cataloguing, filing equipment, etc. The last named is the only one in operation at present, composed of Mrs. Virginia Leddy Gambrell and Miss Nona Lucke. At our annual meeting last year Mrs. Gambrell presented a paper on "Housing and Storage of Records," based on her study of current filing equipment. The committee has been preparing a questionnaire to be sent to state archivists to ascertain what filing methods they employ; later this survey will be extended into the field of historical manuscript depositories. A subsequent report based on these findings should prove of great value especially in connection with post-war demands for equipment and improved practices of mutual interest to the manufacturer and the consumer.

Reference has been made earlier in this report to special fields of records

that merit consideration by this Society. Until the past year, when it was suspended because of the war, we had a Committee on Business Archives which surveyed the problems pertaining thereto, gathered information, promoted discussion at the meetings of the Society and elsewhere, and circulated among certain firms a broadside on "Why Business Records Should Be Preserved." What are the prospects of probing other special fields such as educational institutions, religious and fraternal organizations, labor unions, and a variety of social groups? A selected list might be compiled of organizations showing evidence of an interest or potential interest in their records through the library service which they maintain for their own purposes. The librarian or official in charge might become the medium through whom an appreciation of non-current records could be fostered and developed into an archival program that would assure preservation of the records and their accessibility for research. It is quite likely that much of the preliminary data for such an approach could be obtained through the co-operation of the Special Libraries Association. The Society of American Archivists could provide certain professional advice and information, engage in some fact-finding on its own account, and incidentally increase its membership.

The category of promotional committee work embraces the broad expanse of our professional interests and more immediately the efforts to encourage the growth of our Society. The latter is to a large degree the responsibility of the Membership Committee and will be discussed later in connection with a few statistics on members and subscribers. The Committee on Public Relations is concerned with ways and means of promoting public interest in the support for archives. Some correspondence has been carried on with states engaged in plans and programs for new or enlarged archival agencies. The opportunity for developing a clearing house of information on such projects by this committee will be enhanced by the uniform law for the creation of a state archival agency which our Society now has to offer. Obviously the Committee on Public Relations should contribute substantially to the movement for post-war planning. The Committee on Collection and Preservation of Materials for the History of Emergencies has continued its program of the preceding year for the most part, with particular attention to newspaper sources in the Chicago area where the chairman, Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, has generously made available some assistance through the McCormick Historical Association. The possibility of this committee's encouragement of the collection of war history materials by state and local authorities through co-operation with the national Committee on Conservation of Cultural Resources no longer exists since the latter became defunct last summer; but a similar opportunity is afforded by the recent sponsorship of this project by the American Association for State and Local History.

The Committee on International Relations under the chairmanship of Mr. Gaston Litton has surveyed this field, with special emphasis on Latin America,

to determine what might be done to promote archival developments in these countries by personal contacts and dissemination of information and to advance scholarship by making more accessible materials for research there and in the United States for the mutual benefit of all concerned. The recommendations of the committee which will be presented to the Society for consideration, propose an exchange of archivists among the Americas, means of increasing the membership of the Society abroad, exchange of professional journals and scientific articles, and the preparation and exchange of microfilms and archival guides. The last point supplements a resolution on this subject voted by this Society at its business meeting last year. *Cf.* THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST, VI (January, 1943), 51, 52.

A final group of committees I have classified under the heading of planning and policy, although they involve certain promotional aspects also. The Committee on Uniform Legislation (Professor A. R. Newsome, chairman) not only has achieved an enviable reputation for accomplishment in the past but continues to live up to it. The value of the earlier fruits of their labors is attested to by the fact that the supply of the "Proposed Uniform State Public Records Act," published and reprinted in 1940, was already exhausted some time ago. This year the committee has submitted its draft of a proposed uniform state law for the creation of a state archival agency, previously referred to in this report. The council has taken action today on this excellent document and recommended that it be published forthwith in THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST.

Dr. Ernst Posner and his Committee on Training of Archivists have pursued their study of training programs, some results of which have been discussed at former meetings of this Society and published. The object of the committee during the past year can best be revealed by a quotation from its report:

It had been realized . . . that mere theoretical discussion of an ideal training program would be of little avail as long as our basis of practical experience could not be broadened because of the war. It seemed timely therefore to postpone further discussion of the training of professional archivists and to devote the activities of the committee to exploring ways and means of educating the lay custodians of archival material. . . .

In order to implement such a program the committee sought to determine the phases of archival work concerning which information should be disseminated; to compile brief lists of reading on those phases and have them published; and to get competent persons to deal with these subjects in brief and popular articles. All of them together would then constitute a little manual for lay custodians. It is suggested that "it might be preferable for the Society to work through a Committee on Local Archives consisting of persons who are fully familiar with the local sphere."

Another new line of advance in the realm of planning is represented by the Committee on Archival Buildings. Although only recently established, the significance of its potential operations, in view of the needs and opportunities of post-war planning, have already been demonstrated at the opening session of the present meeting. Captain Victor Gondos, Jr., who participated in this session, is chairman of the committee. Its deliberations and conclusions, we hope, will soon be given practical application in days of peace.

A few remarks may be in order regarding the secretary's office, which is the chief clearing house for the Society's business throughout the year. To whatever extent the wheels have run smoothly during 1943 is to be credited to the notable accomplishments of my predecessor, Dr. Philip C. Brooks, and to the momentum carried over from his creative work since the founding of the Society. I have sought his advice repeatedly at the risk of imposing on his good nature. Fortunately for me, the University of Virginia is not far distant from the National Archives. I also take this occasion to report that official records of the Society of American Archivists were expertly classified and well filed up to November, 1942. During the first seven years of existence a part of our records have become archival in character. They are incomplete because some of our former officers and committee chairmen have not transferred their files to the custody of the secretary's office. In making this appeal on behalf of our own records, let charity among archivists begin at home in their professional family.

As we anticipated, the war along with other factors, has affected our membership. The situation is serious enough to warrant careful consideration. The Membership Committee, with Dr. Brooks as chairman, has analyzed the problem and has intensified its campaign, according to plan, during the weeks before the annual meeting. Continued military victories by the United Nations are likely to ease the strain on our membership, but we are not counting on a bull market in archival stock. The number of individual members at present is 260, representing a net gain of 12 as compared with last year's figures. Institutional memberships total 34, the same as of a year ago. The number of subscriptions is 68, representing a net gain of 7. We are indebted to Dr. Brooks for a statistical table in the report of the Membership Committee, analyzing the distribution of members and subscribers by geographical areas and by the kind of agencies with which the members are associated (*viz.*, official archives; manuscript collections, historical societies, and private agencies; federal agencies other than the National Archives; and a miscellaneous group). It is clear from his analysis that opportunities are available in several directions to secure new members and subscribers. In some instances the results will depend upon the Society's efforts in investigating archival problems hitherto unworked.

It is with deep regret that we note the death of two members of the Society during the past year. Elizabeth Towar Platt, who died on May 22, 1943, had been associated with the American Geographical Society since 1920 as librarian

and bibliographer. She contributed to *Social Science Abstracts* and to the *Bibliographie Géographique Internationale* and was the founder (1938) and editor of *Current Geographical Publications*. As geographer as well as bibliographer, Miss Platt has left her impress on the world of scholarship.

Morgan P. Robinson, state archivist of Virginia since 1914, died on October 24, 1943. He did much to arouse public interest in the protection and care of public records in his native state. A founding member of this Society, he was a regular attendant at its annual meetings. For many years he was corresponding secretary of the Virginia Historical Society. He was also a fellow of the Royal Historical Society and of the Royal Society of Arts.

It will interest the members to know that the secretary, in co-operation with Messrs. Brooks, Duniway, and Trever, has compiled a list of state archival authorities with the names of officials in charge. This information will be transcribed into a card file and kept up to date, as a reference service for our members by correspondence. It might conceivably become the nucleus of a handbook on archival organizations.

Operating under a conservative budget during the past year, the Society has kept its expenditures well within its income. While revenue from membership dues and subscriptions has increased slightly, income has been augmented by sale of an unusually large number of back copies of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*. In several cases complete files of the journal were wanted by new subscribers.

I conclude this protracted report with an expression of appreciation to the officers and members of the Society with whom it has been my privilege to work. I have enjoyed the correspondence with President Connor and other members of the Council who have advised me on current business and matters of policy, with the editor and his staff, committee chairmen, and others whose co-operation has aided in the year's activities. In view of the Society's previous accomplishment and its awareness of vital problems at hand, I believe we are justified in venturing a note of confidence in our ability to move forward. What has been done wrong or left undone during the past year rests mainly on the head of the secretary.

Respectfully submitted,

LESTER J. CAPPON, *Secretary*

Minutes of the Business Meeting, November 15, 1943

The Society convened in its annual business meeting in the Grill Room of the Nassau Tavern, Princeton, New Jersey, at 10 P.M., November 15, 1943, approximately sixty members attending.

The minutes of the previous business meeting were approved. The reports of the secretary, the treasurer, and the auditing committee were read and approved.

By direction of the council the secretary read the report of the Committee

on International Relations containing recommendations concerning exchange of archivists among the Americas, increasing the membership of the Society among the archival fraternity abroad, exchange of professional journals and of scientific articles, and preparation and exchange of microfilms and archival guides.

Voted, to adopt these recommendations in principle and refer them to the committee for action.

On recommendation of the council, voted, that the secretary draft a letter to the President of the United States to urge that an American archivist be appointed to the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, to represent the interests of archival science.

The secretary announced that the council has voted to instruct him to draft a proposed amendment to the constitution providing for transfer from individual annual to life membership with such credit on dues already paid as the council may determine. Under the constitution, "copies of the proposed amendments shall be mailed by the secretary to all members at least thirty days in advance of the meeting at which they are [it is] to be considered."

On recommendation of the council, voted, that the Society accept the invitation to be represented at the Tenth Scientific Congress to be held at Santiago, Chile, in January, 1944.

Voted, to approve the report of the resolutions committee, read by its chairman, Herbert A. Kellar, as follows:

Resolved, that this Society desires to express its appreciation to the individuals, organizations, and institutions who have made this meeting so worthwhile an occasion, and instructs its secretary to communicate this resolution to Dr. Julian P. Boyd, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements and to the other members of that committee, to Princeton University, to Dr. W. Neil Franklin, chairman of the Program Committee, to those who have contributed papers and addresses and to the management of the Nassau Tavern.

Resolved, that this Society extends its greetings to the British Records Association and its congratulations upon the maintenance of archival interest in England during the war, as evidenced by Mr. Jenkinson's excellent paper; and that the secretary be instructed to communicate this resolution to the officials of the British Records Association.

Resolved, that this Society desires to express its appreciation to Dr. Lester J. Cappon for his valuable and faithful services as secretary of the organization during the past year.

The report of the nominating committee was read by William D. Overman who presented the following slate: for president, Margaret C. Norton; for

vice-president, Julian P. Boyd; for secretary, Lester J. Cappon; for treasurer, Helen L. Chatfield; for council member for a term of five years ending in 1948, Solon J. Buck. There being no nominations from the floor, the president called for the vote of the Society on the above nominees and each was elected.

The remaining council members continue to hold office for the following periods: William D. McCain, one year ending in 1944; Morris L. Radoff, two years ending in 1945; Herbert A. Kellar, three years ending in 1946; Philip C. Brooks, four years ending in 1947.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 P.M.

LESTER J. CAPPON, *Secretary*

Minutes of the Council, November 15, 1943

The council met at the Nassau Tavern, Princeton, New Jersey, at 4:45 P.M., November 15, 1943, the president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and Philip C. Brooks and Herbert A. Kellar attending.

The following qualified applicants were elected to membership in the Society: Kenneth F. Bartlett, Herbert O. Brayer, Mary Boyd Brown, Harry L. Coles, Jr., Elza R. de Marigny, Linwood E. Donaldson, Mrs. W. O. Harrell, Margareth Jorgensen, Robert H. Lando, Mrs. George MacNeill, Thomas D. Murphy, Florence E. Nichol, Harold T. Pinkett, Emma M. Scheffler, Edward J. Sheehan, Gust Skordas, Lester W. Smith, George J. Stansfield, Robert E. Stone, Sophie A. Udin, Alexander W. Weddell, and Dorothy L. Wood.

Voted, that a standing Committee on Honorary Membership be appointed, consisting of the president, vice-president, and secretary.

Recommended, that the editor be requested to publish the model state archival act, *viz.* "An Act to Create the [name of state] Department of Archives and History," drafted and submitted by the Committee on Uniform Legislation, and that the act be laid before the Society next year.

The council discussed the report of the Committee on International Relations containing recommendations concerning exchange of archivists among the Americas, increasing the membership of the Society among the archival fraternity abroad, exchange of professional journals and of scientific articles, and preparation and exchange of microfilms and archival guides. It was agreed that the recommendations be referred to the Society for action.

Recommended, that the Society adopt the following motion: That the secretary draft a letter to the President of the United States to urge that an American archivist be appointed to the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, to represent the interests of archival science.

The secretary raised the question whether it is advisable to continue the

suspension of members in foreign countries during the war as authorized by vote of the council in 1941 as follows:

to authorize the secretary to retain as members or subscribers persons or institutions in foreign countries who are unable to continue payment of dues on account of the war and state their intention to make up the deficits caused by such non-payment when peace is restored.

It was pointed out that few members have availed themselves of this opportunity; that it is impossible to keep posted on the whereabouts of such members to inform them of the offer; and that back copies of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST will be available for purchase by those members who have let their dues lapse for the duration.

Voted, to rescind the above action of the council.

The council discussed the suggestion that individual annual members be permitted to transfer to life membership with some credit for dues already paid.

Voted, to instruct the secretary to draft a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for transfer from individual annual to life membership with such credit on dues already paid as the council may determine.

Recommended, that the Society accept the invitation to be represented at the Tenth Scientific Congress to be held at Santiago, Chile, in January, 1944.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

LESTER J. CAPPON, *Secretary*

Minutes of the Council, November 16, 1943

The council met at the Nassau Tavern, Princeton, New Jersey, at 8:30 A.M., November 16, 1943, the secretary and treasurer, and Philip C. Brooks, Solon J. Buck, and Herbert A. Kellar attending.

Voted, to appoint Mr. Kellar president *pro tempore* for this session.

Voted, to appoint Grace L. Nute as a member of the Editorial Board for a term of four years ending in 1947.

Voted, that the president be authorized to appoint a Committee on Publicity to circulate news notes and announcements about the Society.

The secretary suggested that the activities of the Society might be expanded in numerous fields of special archives such as educational institutions, religious and fraternal organizations, business firms, labor unions, and a variety of social groups; that an appreciation of noncurrent records by such institutions might be developed into an archival program to assure preservation of their records and accessibility for research; and that preliminary data for such an approach

could be obtained through the co-operation of the Special Libraries Association. Mr. Kellar suggested an approach by means of speeches on records and archives at the regional chapter meetings of Special Libraries Association. He also recommended the printing of a brochure on the subject at a later date.

Voted, that the president be authorized to appoint a Committee on Institutional Archives to investigate this problem.

The secretary announced that one hundred separates of the bibliography of "Writings on Archives and Manuscripts, July, 1942-June, 1943," by Karl L. Trever, published in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*, October, 1943, have been printed.

Voted, that the Trever separate be sold at twenty-five cents per copy and that publicity about it be handled by the new publicity committee.

Messrs. Trever and Herman Kahn, on invitation of the council, joined the meeting to participate in discussion of certain publication matters. Mr. Trever proposed that a select list of readings on archives and manuscripts prior to June 30, 1942, be compiled by himself and Mr. Ernst Posner and published. Mr. Buck suggested that the list include selected items since June, 1942, as well.

Voted, to direct the Committee on Writings, of which Mr. Trever is chairman, to proceed with the proposed compilation.

For purposes of economy, voted, that the council request the Editorial Board to discontinue the present system of contributors' and news notes and book review editors' copies of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* and that authors be provided with excerpts (cut from the journal) or separates of their articles.

In view of the paper shortage the council suggests that the editor examine methods of *Agricultural History* and other journals to consider expansion of material in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* by printing more text per page.

Voted, that the editor and Editorial Board co-operate with the Committee on Archival Research in stimulating the preparation of articles to be submitted for possible publication in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*. The council directed the secretary to write a letter to the new Committee on Archival Research to request the preparation of a list of authors and articles for submission to the editor.

Mr. Brooks suggested possible co-operation of the Society with the American Library Association's Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas in order to provide copies of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* published during the war period for the benefit of devastated libraries after the war. The

secretary was directed to communicate with this committee of the A.L.A. to secure further information on the subject.

The secretary announced that he has received verbal invitations to the Society to hold its eighth annual meeting at Albany, New York; Columbus, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. It was decided to postpone action until a later date because of war conditions.

The proposed budget for 1944 was presented, discussed, and approved.

Voted, that the treasurer invest in United States Victory Bonds as much of the funds of the Society as can be spared after making the necessary allowance for current operations.

The council, having recessed at 10:00 A.M. and reconvened at 4:30 P.M., adjourned at 5:35 P.M.

LESTER J. CAPPON, *Secretary*

Report of the Committee on Membership

This is to report on the activities of the membership committee so far this year and to add certain information and comments that seem pertinent. So far as the committee's work is concerned it is so far one of too little and too late, although results will be forthcoming that will not be apparent until after the annual meeting.

The chairman can report having kept up a light correspondence with and about prospective members. Of fifteen new members whose names have come to me so far in this calendar year, ten were evidently products of that correspondence and personal interviews.¹

The file of names of prospectives has been entirely revised and names have been added to it from time to time during the year. The other members of the committee, Suda Bane, Mary E. Givens, Kenneth Blood, and John Clement, have made suggestions both of names and of revisions in mailing matter.

The chairman participated with Messrs. Cappon, Trever, and Duniway in preparing a list of state archival authorities, not solely for the use of this committee but which will be most useful to it. It is hoped that this list can be kept up to date from a variety of sources. Several copies of it are available in typed form for those who may be interested.

It has always seemed best to have the membership campaign close to the annual meeting, as that is one of the most concrete activities of the Society that can be used to interest prospectives. Letters were sent to more than three hundred selected individuals and to about a hundred institutions. With the letters went leaflets containing information and application blanks, lists of selected articles in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*, and to many of the prospectives copies of the announcement of the seventh annual meeting. Programs went to about a third of the list.

Judging from past experience a five per cent return on the campaign—one new member out of each twenty prospects—would be above our best hopes.² This year on account of the war, taxes, and what not it will be more difficult than ever to gain new members—but it is more than ever important to do so.

¹ Of twenty-two new members elected at the Princeton meeting, all had been circularized by the committee. They made a net gain of four individual members. Applications had been received from three institutions and three individuals early in December.

² Returns on individual prospectives proved to be more than ten per cent.

While I am not quite up to date on the actual statistics of membership, and only the secretary can be at any moment, my opinion is that we have held our membership as well as could be expected during the war. But we should try to increase it, and especially to make it more widely representative of geographical areas and classes of membership. On the latter points I have some suggestive statistics. They are compiled from information at hand as of September, on the basis of 326 members and subscribers. This is probably not precisely accurate, nor can any of the percentages be, but it is indicative of the distribution of our clientele.

A table is enclosed, indicating among other things that of 231 individual members in this country as of September, about 15% were in New York and New England, 47% in the Middle Atlantic area (District of Columbia to New Jersey), 10% in the South Atlantic, 6% in the South Central (Mississippi to Texas), 15% in the Middle West, and 8% in the Far West (Colorado to the coast). These percentages are not surprising, but it may be hoped that in time other sections will develop larger representations in relation to the Middle Atlantic area.

Subscriptions followed a pattern generally similar to that of the individual members, and totalled fifty-three in this country. The twenty-seven institutional members in this country, however, happened to fall into quite a different distribution, with 22% in New York and New England, 11% in the Middle Atlantic area, 15% South Atlantic, 4% South Central, 40% Middle West, and 7% Far West.

Another breakdown shows that (although there may be possible errors in assignments to categories) 41% of the individual members were in official archival agencies and 29% in historical societies of manuscripts collecting agencies. Of the official archivists, 27% of the total are in the National Archives, and 14% in state archives, none in local. Of the manuscripts custodians, or related officials, 14% of the total are in manuscripts collections of universities, 6% in state historical societies, and 10% in private societies or agencies. Besides these, 16% of the total are in federal agencies other than the National Archives, 1.5% in business firms, and 10% unclassified, such as university professors and private citizens.

Any quotation of them should be qualified by allowance of a small margin for error. At least they will indicate to the committee and possibly to the council some places for emphasis in future membership work.

In another year the committee might well undertake a special campaign for library subscriptions. While our chief need so far as activities is concerned is for enthusiastic individual members, the primary aim from a financial point of view should be to get more institutional members, and a secondary aim to get subscribers, as they are both likely to be more stable than individuals.

Our foreign members and subscribers are heavily weighted in the British Empire for rather obvious reasons and this is more than ever true since the war has cut off communication with former members in the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, China, and Germany. The committee on international relations has some ideas with which the membership committee may co-operate in developing membership in Latin America. I have recently had several conversations here with a prominent Mexican archivist who told me about the Mexican Society of Archivists and said he thought it would be possible for us to get some members in that country. Complications of international finance work against us.

One problem recently mentioned by the secretary of the Society is worth attention, though I am not sure that we can do anything about it without antagonizing valued customers. That is the practice of some archivists to serve only as representatives of their institutions, and not to take individual memberships. This reduces our memberships and the number of active individuals—the provision that only individual members can hold office is probably not a weighty club over these persons. I am somewhat skeptical about

application of a rule one organization enforces, which prevents acceptance of payment by state institutions for the memberships of individuals.

Members at large have co-operated with the committee by sending in the names of many good prospectives, and their assistance is of fundamental importance.

The chairman of the committee shares strongly the view that is now becoming fairly widespread among members of the Society that the quarterly journal should be more widely representative of the various interests of all the members. This is a problem for the editor and the editorial board, but its effect upon membership work is great.

Respectfully submitted,
 PHILIP C. BROOKS, *Chairman*

Report of the Committee on Archival Buildings

The following activities are now in progress:

1. The first objective, with the assistance of the photostating plant of the National Archives, is to acquire a collection of plans and specifications of all, or at least a representative group of modern archival plants. To date we have a set of plans of the Maryland Hall of Records and a set on loan from the Delaware Hall of Records.

2. The preparation of papers for the annual meeting at Princeton has occupied the time of the chairman and of Mr. Van Schreeven of the committee. It is thought that perhaps these two papers with that of Mr. Louis Simon, architect and one of the early planners of the National Archives, may be used as a nucleus for committee publications.

The chairman's activities to date have been hampered by an unexpected rush of work in connection with the War Department's recently inaugurated and extensive disposal program. Until this work abates in volume and intensity, the projected program the chairman has in mind will take longer to unfold than originally expected.

This program includes the following items:

1. A study on official and technical procedures for an archival building committee, on the state level.
2. A report on comparative specifications of modern archival structures and equipment.
3. A report on standard design data for archival plants at various levels:
 - a. State archives, costing less than half a million dollars.
 - b. County archives, principally vaults.
 - c. Other local archival depositories.
 - d. Multiple function buildings consisting of state library, state historical society, and state archives.
4. A study on remodeling problems.

It is needless to remark than any one of these proposed items is capable of absorbing an immense amount of time and work, and, in view of the fact that each member of the committee is busy in his regular occupation, to fix any stated time limits is hardly practicable.

VICTOR GONDOS, JR., A.I.A., *Chairman*

Report of the Committee on Training of Archivists

It has been realized during the first year of the committee's existence that the problems of the training of professional archivists had been studied thoroughly and competently by previous committees and that mere theoretical discussion of an ideal training program would be of little avail as long as our basis of practical experience could not be broadened because of the war. It seemed timely therefore to postpone further discussion of the training of professional archivists and to devote the activities of the committee to exploring

ways and means of educating the lay custodians of archival material. A program along these lines was accepted by the members of the committee and approved by the president of the Society on February 23, 1943.

Much correspondence was had with the members of the committee on how to implement the new program, especially with Miss Margaret C. Norton. Since it seemed futile to work out programs for training conferences, which, for obvious reasons, could not be held in war-time, it was proposed to proceed in the following manner:

1. To determine the phases of archives work concerning which information should be spread among lay custodians.
2. To assemble brief lists of readings on the different phases and to have them published in *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* or in *Illinois Libraries*.
3. To get competent people to deal with these phases in brief and popular articles and to have these published. All of them together would then constitute a little manual for lay custodians of archives, something of an American equivalent to Fowler's book on the *Care of Muniments*.

As regards the articles, it was important to know that *Illinois Libraries* would be willing to publish them and to furnish the desirable number of reprints.

In the meantime the present writer had begun working for the American Council of Learned Societies' Committee on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas, and this work, closely connected with the progress of the allied armies in Europe, kept him under constant great pressure. As a result, he found it difficult to devote the necessary time to his committee work. He compiled, however, a tentative list of headings for the bibliography, which, at the same time, indicated the topics to be treated in articles, and sent it to Miss Norton who proved a most competent and kind adviser with respect to the whole program. Her article on "Record Vaults" in the November issue of *Illinois Libraries* indicates at least that our committee is giving attention to the problems to which it has set itself, although of course the article is entirely Miss Norton's own work. It might very well serve as a model for the other articles we are planning.

From the above it appears that the achievements of the committee are far from being impressive, mainly because of default on the part of its chairman. As to the future, he should like to state that, in his opinion, the enlightenment of lay custodians constitutes one of the most important objectives of the Society and should remain on its program. The present Committee on Training is probably not well qualified to serve the Society in this respect since its chairman and most of its members lack the indispensable experience in dealing with local material and with local custodians. It might be preferable for the Society to work through a Committee on Local Archives consisting of persons who are fully familiar with the local sphere. As to the training of professional archivists, the present writer is still inclined to feel that the content of a training program for them has been clearly stated by Dr. Buck in his article on "The Training of American Archivists," *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*, IV (April, 1940), 84-90. Whether the problems of professional post-war training warrant the establishing of a special committee he does not want to decide.

ERNST POSNER, *Chairman*

Some Recommendations of the Committee on International Relations of the Society of American Archivists

I. *Exchange of Archivists among the Americas*

Distinguished Latin Americans from all walks of life are being invited currently to come to the United States, at the expense of the State Department and as a part of the

cultural relations program. There also has been a program, now in abeyance but likely to be revived at the close of the war, for the awarding of fellowships to Americans to study, teach, and observe in Latin America.

1. It is recommended that a letter be prepared for the president of the Society calling upon the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State to consider archivists among those who are being brought to this country now or who may be selected to go to Latin America later.

II. *Increase the Membership of the Society*

In starting a campaign to build up the membership of the Society among the archival fraternity abroad, which seems a desirable objective, the following proposals are made:

1. Because of the unfavorable rate of exchange, Latin Americans generally cannot afford membership in the Society at the rate of five American dollars annually. It is strongly advised, therefore, that a special rate be approved and announced for foreigners.

2. A suggestion has been advanced that the Society inaugurate a "gift subscription" program along the pattern of that originated by *Reader's Digest*, whereby American archivists could sponsor "get acquainted subscriptions" for Latin-American individuals or institutions. In the event the American Council of Learned Societies or any of the other foundations would agree to underwrite such a project a modest list of the state, private and ecclesiastical archivists could be drawn up by this committee (or one appointed for that purpose) from the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* (archives section) and from a canvass of the Latin-American historians in this country.

3. Because it is felt that an especially intimate understanding should exist among the archivists of the Western Hemisphere, efforts should also be made to bring our Canadian colleagues closer into our orbit.

III. *Exchange of Professional Journals*

Not the least effective method of furthering general good will among the archivists of this hemisphere would be by the exchange of professional journals. Therefore it is recommended that:

1. The Society offer to swap with the national archives of the Latin-American countries sets of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST for files of their journals. Or, if for one reason or another this cannot be worked out, there is proposed as an alternative recommendation a simple two-way exchange of future issues of these publications. The secretary might become the custodian of such publications received from abroad. These could be advertised in a "Wants and Offers" section of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST (such as the *A. L. A. Bulletin* runs) and distributed upon request, or at the discretion of the secretary, or as the Society might direct.

IV. *Exchange of Scientific Articles*

The following four-point recommendation has been drawn upon from suggestions offered by our most distinguished Latin-American historians:

1. The bulletins of the national archives of Latin America should be carefully studied by this committee (or by one appointed for that purpose) and a selection made of several of their better and most descriptive articles for the consideration of the editor for possible publication in THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST.

2. Several of the technical and descriptive articles from the back files of THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST should be chosen by the same means, possibly translated into Spanish and Portuguese, and sent to editors for reproduction in the journals of Latin American archives. In a letter to the chairman on August 24, 1943, Dr. John Tate Lanning stated that "In my opinion, the Society of American Archivists can best develop a program of

co-operation with Latin American archives by sending them archival publications, particularly any describing our methods and techniques—systems of cataloging, photography, filing, prevention of insects, etc. It has been my experience that Latin Americans are more interested in these technical aspects than they are in others.” Fire prevention and proper housing are other subjects on which scientific information would undoubtedly be very welcome among our southern neighbors.

3. A strong effort should be made to get Latin-American archivists to contribute directly to *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*. There should be no special reluctance to accept articles in Spanish or Portuguese; indeed, the publication of such articles in their original language might enhance our journal among the Good Neighbor readers.

4. Reprints of articles and copies of other archival materials should be provided the secretary for distribution to Latin-American archivists upon demand or his discretion.

V. Preparation and Exchange of Microfilms and Archival Guides

The knowledge that there is abundant material in the archives of the United States of interest to the historians and scholars of the Latin-American nations, on one hand, and that there are valuable sources in the archives of those nations which would be of interest to students and scholars in this country, urge the consideration of a proposal that:

1. The Society get behind a plan, whether financed by the government or private funds, looking to the exchange of microfilm copies of such materials between the nations of the Americas.

2. The Society back, with any other interested organizations, a program for the systematic calendaring and publishing of lists or guides to the archival collections in the other nations of America.

3. Every effort should be made to avoid creating the impression that we are skimming off the cream of their valuable collections and carrying it off to the United States and to erase that impression wherever it may already exist.

GASTON LITTON, *Chairman*

The secretary would like to purchase copies of the January, April, and October, 1938; January, 1939; and April, 1941, issues of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*. The secretary will repurchase these issues at fifty cents a copy.

At a joint session of the Society of American Archivists and the American Historical Association held December 29, 1943, Rebecca Rankin of the Municipal Reference Library, New York City, discussed municipal administrative archives and Oliver W. Holmes discussed federal archives.

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Recent accessions have greatly added to the already large collection of photographs in the National Archives. Exclusive of duplicates, there are now more than 800,000 glass-plate and film negatives, tintypes, stereoscopic views, color transparencies, paper prints, radiophotos, microfilm, and other types of photographs in the National Archives. The largest group relates to military affairs. Transfers from the Signal Corps and the Historical Section of the Army War College have concentrated in the National Archives the major pictorial records of all the wars in which the United States has been engaged

from the beginning of the Civil War through the first World War. Among the earliest items are the Civil War pictures made by Mathew B. Brady and T. H. O'Sullivan and the latter's photographs of the Darien expedition of 1872. Also significant historically and photographically are the International Boundary Commission pictures, 1892-1894, of border towns, mines, and missions, the late nineteenth century hand-colored lantern slides of T. H. McAllister, and the Jackson photographs of Yellowstone Park and the Far West.

Another large group of special records in the National Archives—maps and charts—has also been increased by recent transfers. Among the materials received are the maps, many of them of strategic areas, compiled by the Cartographic Study, a New York City WPA project; Army Map Service maps, 1870-1942, of various countries and areas, chiefly European; Naval Intelligence maps, 1875-1935, of countries throughout the world, with some emphasis on Mexico, other parts of Latin America, and the Far East; and the entire body of manuscript maps, 1855-1936, of the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, that embody the results of sounding and other hydrographic surveys in foreign waters.

Other accessions of note are certain scientifically interesting files of the Hydrographic Office, including records of naval expeditions, 1811-1939; War Department records such as the general court-martial records, 1917-1920, records of various military departments and posts, 1857-1910, and Confederate and Union army records; anti-trust files of the Department of Justice, 1920-1933; and records of the United States Antarctic Service, 1939-1942.

Miss Maria do Carmo Almeida, a Brazilian student who has just finished a year of study at Syracuse University, spent the month of December at the National Archives studying procedures. She has been sent to this country by the Department of Internal Administration, an agency roughly comparable to a combination of our Civil Service Commission and Bureau of the Budget, to study archival methods that might be applied in a projected reorganization of the Brazilian archival system.

The archivist of the United States has announced the appointment of Dan Lacy, formerly assistant to the archivist, as director of operations. Philip C. Brooks, formerly assistant director of records accessioning and preservation, has been made assistant director of operations. Thad Page, administrative secretary, will serve also as chief of the Division of Legislative Archives, and Elizabeth E. Hamer, formerly acting chief of the Division of Information and Publications, has been named assistant administrative secretary. Gerald J. Davis, a member of the National Archives staff for six years, has been appointed chief of the Division of Justice Department Archives. Members of the staff who have recently been transferred to do records administration or re-

search work in other government agencies include Forrest L. Foor, Elbert L. Huber, Gibbs Myers, Marie C. Stark, and Harvey J. Winter. Among members of the staff who have recently entered the armed services are Kenneth W. Munden, Allen M. Ross, and Jerome Thomases. Edward G. Campbell and Robert Claus have returned to the National Archives after receiving honorable discharges from the army.

The National Archives has issued as its *Records Administration Circular* No. 5, a paper by Dr. Ernst Posner, a former archivist at the Privy State Archives in Berlin and now adjunct professor of archival administration at the American University, entitled "The Administration of Current Records in Italian Public Agencies." The paper was prepared at the request of the archivist of the United States for the assistance it might render in the administration of occupied territory. Also recently issued is a document entitled *The National Archives—What It Is and What It Does*.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress has been granted \$17,650 by the Rockefeller Foundation to be used within a two-year period for the development of its Archive of Hispanic Culture. Established in 1940 to meet the need for materials on Latin American art, the collection now includes 1,500 slides and about 6,000 photographs of art objects from all periods in all Latin-American countries. The archive is under the direction of Robert C. Smith, assistant director of the Hispanic Foundation, and Miss Elizabeth Wilder.

Under an agreement made between motion picture producers and the Library of Congress in April, 1942, the library is permitted to select from films copyrighted during any given year for deposit in its collections those films having documentary significance. During the past year the library has selected 104 films and parts of films under this arrangement.

Grace Gardner Griffin's descriptive guide to the Manuscript Division's collection of reproductions of manuscripts in British archives, libraries, and other depositories, described as in course of preparation in the January, 1943, issue of *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST*, is now completed. Copy has been submitted to the librarian for transmittal to the Government Printing Office.

On June 27, 1943, the trustees of Tuskegee Institute voted unanimously to give the institute's entire collection of Booker T. Washington papers to the Library of Congress. Comprising over 180,000 pieces and covering the period 1885-1915, it is one of the larger collections now in the Division of Manuscripts. Another large collection recently accessioned (restricted for the present) consists of the papers of Senator Albert J. Beveridge for the period 1900-1911.

OFFICE OF RECORDS ADMINISTRATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT

Increased pressure for office space in Washington has led to the establishment of another records depository under the supervision of the Office of Records Administration. This new depository, located in Philadelphia, houses principally the records of military and civilian personnel of the navy who are no longer in service. About 35,000 cubic feet of such records have been transferred at the present time, though the quantity will increase steadily as the war progresses. Some 10,000 cubic feet of these records were withdrawn from the National Archives because of the increased use of them by the department as a result of the war. The Philadelphia depository also is used to sift non-current ship files and records of discontinued naval activities in the eastern part of the country and to separate the valuable records to be transferred to the National Archives from those to be reported to Congress for disposal.

Another records depository, which serves the Navy Department and the naval establishment in the Washington area, has been removed from an old building in Alexandria, Virginia, to a renovated garage building in the center of Washington. It can accommodate about 25,000 cubic feet of records and also provides quarters for the workrooms and laboratories of the microfilming unit of the Office of Records Administration. A third depository under the supervision of the office is located in the Middle West for the storage of security microfilm copies of records vital to the navy.

Three additional studies based on naval records have been prepared under the supervision of R. G. Albion, recorder of naval administration, in co-operation with the office. Two of these were prepared by Henry P. Beers of the National Archives, one entitled *U. S. Naval Port Officers in the Bordeaux Region, 1917-1919* and the other *United States Naval Forces in Northern Russia (Archangel and Murmansk), 1918-1919*. Accompanying the first of these studies is a reproduction of a pamphlet published in 1919 giving United States naval port regulations for the port of Bordeaux. The third recent study was prepared by A. C. Davidonis of Princeton University under the title *The American Naval Mission in the Adriatic, 1918-1921*.

Lt. (j.g.) J. Hamilton Lane, formerly associated with the Systems Division of Remington Rand, Inc., and instructor in business administration at the College of the City of New York, and Lt. (j.g.) Everett O. Alldredge, formerly acting chief of the Document Security Section of the Office of Economic Warfare and prior to that a member of the National Archives staff, have joined the staff, and Edmund D. Dwyer, who came to the office from the War Department several months ago, has been commissioned a lieutenant, junior grade, in the naval reserve. Lt. Alldredge is in charge of the naval records depository at Philadelphia. The correspondence management program of the office has been strengthened by the appointment of Marian O. Barnes, formerly co-ordinator of correspondence of the Civil Service Commission, to

assist Lt. (j.g.) Charles H. Niemann, who is in charge of the program.

Lt. Comdr. Emmett J. Leahy, director of records administration, and Lt. Joseph P. Brennan, officer in charge of the Microphotographic Service, have just returned from a two-month trip to Africa and the United Kingdom to install projects of the office.

FOREIGN NEWS

Canada

The September, 1943, issue of the *Canadian Historical Review* carries an interesting article by D. C. Harvey of the Public Archives of Nova Scotia on the life and work of Douglas Brymner, first dominion archivist, 1872-1902. The same issue includes a list of recent accessions of manuscript material to the collections of the Hudson's Bay Company Museum.

China

A Chinese manual on *The Management of Archives* prepared by Chao-fo Lung, formerly in charge of the Kwangsi provincial government archives, is described in the March-June, 1943, issue of the *Quarterly Bulletin of Chinese Bibliography* (English edition). This manual of 138 pages resulted from seven years of research in archives administration on the part of the author, who felt the need of bringing out a book of "practical value based on his own experience—simple in treatment and scientific in principle." The book deals with the "accession, classification, cataloging, stacking, and personnel problems of archives," and includes a fifty-page classification schedule for provincial archives as well as a number of illustrations and forms for ready reference.

Germany

Arvid Fredborg, in a dispatch from Stockholm published in the November 7, 1943, *Washington Post*, indicates that "the breaking of the dams at Moehne and Eder in May of this year [1943] . . . ruined all state registry and other records in a widespread area. This made it easy for persons and especially spies in other parts of Germany to pretend they were from the damaged area. Police would have a tough job tracing them."

Italy

The fate of archives and historical manuscripts in war torn Italy is evidenced almost daily by dispatches in the American press. Homer Bigart's dispatch in the *Washington Post* of August 22, 1943, reports that as he walked through the ruined streets of Messina, Sicily, past the Palace of Justice, which had sustained several direct hits, he noted that "someone had already rifled the archives and bundles of legal papers written in a fine Italian hand were scattered in the dust."

Sicily possessed inestimable treasures in the form of documents and libraries and these have not come out unscathed in spite of the fact that the Fascists had removed the most important material outside the cities. Herbert Mathews, in an article in the *New York Times* of September 3, 1943, states that the Archives of State in Palermo, "which contained continuous historic records of the Kingdom of Naples from the Norman period onward and much other precious material, were unfortunately housed in two buildings near the waterfront. That section, of course, was thoroughly bombed. Those buildings were seriously damaged and many documents remain buried in the ruins. It is hoped that losses will be less than appear from the outside. The former curator has been empowered to unearth what he can, and he has twenty-five workmen on the job now." Mathews also reports that although Palermo's communal library, containing city documents, was spared, he fears that the collection of Greek manuscripts bequeathed by Constantine Lascaris to the University of Messina in the fifteenth century may have been destroyed in their storage vaults in Bronte.

The damage to priceless documents in the burning of Naples is now well known through the press accounts of the deliberate German destruction of the libraries of the University of Naples and the Royal Society of Naples. Fires were started by gasoline touched off by exploding hand grenades in the administrative offices of the university, destroying the archives of the university. Books, manuscripts, and maps in the libraries were set afire at the same time. Dr. Imparato, administrative director of the university, showed Herbert Mathews the room where the archives had been kept. The "floor was nothing but an uneven mass of ashes six inches deep" and the walls were "scarred and pitted and the ceiling had almost collapsed." Many Neopolitan documents had been stored for safety at the villa of Count Filargerri near Capua. Among these records were the registers of the house of Hohenstaufen for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In revenge for the killing of one German soldier, the Germans burned these archives, many of which were basic documents for German as well as Italian history.

When the Germans seized Rome, Edward Kennedy, writing in the *Washington Post* of September 27, 1943, reports that refugees told him that the Nazis were "occupying all the Italian ministries, seizing records," and a dispatch from Wes Gallagher, printed in the same paper on November 6, 1943, quoted refugees as saying that the Germans "proposed to destroy all Italian government records in order to leave a chaotic situation for those who came in to administer the country."

Russia

A United Press dispatch from London on November 6, 1943, reported that during the Nazi occupation of Smolensk "cultural and medical institutions were burned, and their contents either destroyed or sent to Germany."

Mexico

The Sixth Mexican History Convention held at Jalapa, capital of Vera Cruz State, on September 13-20, 1943, recommended to the Ministry of Interior and to the Congress that "the necessary means be taken for the federalization of the archives of the nation or that they be placed in some other form under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government." This recommendation probably refers to the federalization of state and local records. The convention also recommended that "negotiations be opened with the authorities so that Mexican investigators may consult Spanish archives and libraries."

Peru

The National Library of Peru was virtually destroyed by fire on May 10, 1943. Over 100,000 volumes and 40,000 manuscripts were lost together with many maps and geographical works belonging to the Lima Geographical Society housed in the same building. First reports received in the United States indicated that the national archives, housed in an adjoining building, also had been burned, but later information proved this rumor incorrect. The Peruvian government has set aside funds for the construction of a new building, and many American libraries and institutions are co-operating with a national committee, functioning through the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress in the reforming of the National Library's collections.

Spain

The *Christian Science Monitor* in a special article on November 3, 1943, noted that "fleeing from Occupied Europe, most of the men and women who have sought haven in Spain are . . . without identifying papers. . . . The fact that so many stateless persons have no papers to prove their identity or original nationality has been a serious handicap to arrangements for departure [of refugees] even when the individual has the assurance of a destination visa."

GENERAL NEWS

Some months ago the American Council of Learned Societies set up a Committee on Protection of Cultural Treasures in War Areas with headquarters at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. The purpose of the committee is to advise and assist governmental agencies and to help shape public opinion as to the protection of historical monuments, museums, archives, libraries, and cultural institutions in war areas. The committee has solicited the help of volunteer specialists having knowledge of conditions in different war areas, and several agencies, such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Frick Art Reference Library, the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and the Smithsonian Institution have been co-operating actively in its work.

Members of the committee are: William B. Dinsmoor, chairman, Archaeological Institute of America; Sumner McK. Crosby, executive secretary, Yale University; Solon J. Buck, National Archives; George H. Chase, Harvard University; Laurence Vail Coleman, American Association of Museums; David E. Finley, National Gallery of Art; Horace H. F. Jayne, Metropolitan Museum of Art; Harry M. Lydenberg, American Library Association; Archibald MacLeish, Library of Congress; Charles R. Morey, Princeton University; Albert E. Parr, American Museum of Natural History; Paul J. Sachs, Fogg Art Museum; Francis H. Taylor, Metropolitan Museum of Art; Langdon Warner, Harvard University; Alexander Wetmore, Smithsonian Institution; Philip C. Jessup, liaison member, Foreign Economic Administration.

The first year's expenses of the committee are guaranteed by a grant of \$16,500 from the Rockefeller Foundation.

On August 20, 1943, the Department of State announced that the President had approved the establishment of an American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe. "It will function under the auspices of the United States Government and in conjunction with similar groups in other countries for the protection and conservation of works of art and of artistic and historic records of Europe and to aid in the salvaging and restoring to the lawful owners such objects as have been appropriated by the Axis powers or individuals acting under their authority or consent." It will also co-operate with the appropriate branches of the Army and State Department and may be called upon "to furnish museum officials and historians to the General Staff of the Army, so that, so far as is consistent with military necessity, works of cultural value may be protected in countries occupied by the armies of the United Nations."

Members of the American commission are: Owen J. Roberts, chairman, Supreme Court of the United States; David E. Finley, vice-chairman, National Gallery of Art; Huntington Cairns, secretary-treasurer, National Gallery of Art; Herbert Lehman, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitations Administration; Archibald MacLeish, Library of Congress; William B. Dinsmoor, Archaeological Institute of America; Francis H. Taylor, Metropolitan Museum of Art; Paul J. Sachs, Fogg Art Museum.

The headquarters of the American Commission are at the National Gallery of Art, Washington.

A number of subcommittees have been established including a subcommittee of one person, the librarian of Congress, to consider the protection of books, archives, and manuscripts in war areas. Mr. MacLeish has associated with him in an advisory capacity the following specialists who are not members of the American Commission: Solon J. Buck of the National Archives, Waldo G. Leland of the American Council of Learned Societies, Harry M.

Lydenberg of the American Library Association, A. S. Rosenbach of the Rosenbach Company, Philadelphia, and Lewis Hanke of the Library of Congress.

Although the archivist of the United States, as stated above, already is associated with the work of the American Commission in an advisory capacity, the Society of American Archivists, recognizing the great danger to archives and historical manuscripts in war areas and sensing the need for a more direct, official representation of archivists in the work of protecting such materials from the ravages of war, voted at its annual meeting, November 16, to ask President Roosevelt to consider the appointment of a professional archivist to membership on the American Commission.

The American Association of State and Local History has received funds by grant and gift to complete the revision of the *Handbook of Historical Societies in the United States and Canada*, published in 1936 by the Conference of Historical Societies. Christopher Crittenden, a member of the Society of American Archivists and secretary of the North Carolina Department of Archives and History, is the editor. Information concerning historical societies for inclusion in the revised *Handbook* should be sent to Dr. Crittenden, Box 1881, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Among the topics discussed at the annual convention of the American Association of Medical Record Librarians in Buffalo on September 15, 1943, were: medical records administration in the navy; medical records in industry; medical records in modern research; functions of the record department; organization of the work of the record department; and what the United States Public Health Service expects from civilian medical records.

With the publication of the fourth 1942 number of the *Journal of Documentary Reproduction*, the American Library Association's Committee on Photographic Reproduction of Library Materials has decided that for the year 1943, at least, it will "compress the four quarterly publications into one annual volume to be published early in 1944." After the war it is expected that quarterly or more frequent publication will be resumed. Subscribers will be notified from American Library Association headquarters when the 1943 annual is ready.

The November 20, 1943, *Publisher's Weekly* carries the following news item of interest to archivists:

What is probably the most complete consecutive record of an American publishing business are the files of Charles Scribner's Sons, and these letters, contracts and business reports will be used to prepare a memorial volume for the Scribner centenary which falls in 1946. Charles Scribner, head of the house and third of the name, has directed David Randall, head of the rare book department of the Scribner Book Store, to begin

the exploration of the two rooms full of material stored on the third floor of the Fifth Avenue building. . . .

The firm has kept all editorial correspondence and records since 1870 and has extensive files back to the beginning of the house. From both a literary and publishing point of view the material is sure to prove of greatest interest. There are letters in great number from Meredith, Barrie, Riley, Kipling, Stevenson, Mrs. Wharton, Henry James, Thomas Wolfe, Frank Stockton, Sidney Lanier, Eugene Field, to mention but a few, and correspondence showing fine judgment (with occasional errors) of a house directed with publishing genius and guided by such editors as J. G. Holland, Robert Bridges, Edward Burlingame and Maxwell Perkins. From records of such completeness a picture of publishing could be created that would shed light on both the history and practice of publishing.

Both sides of the correspondence are available, author's letters to Scribners and vice versa. All of the house correspondence has been saved, as has that of *Scribner's Magazine*. Lemuel Bangs, who was Scribner's English agent and talent scout for many decades, wrote regularly giving all sorts of information on his contemporaries, while, at one time or another, the firm had extensive correspondence with all the most prominent publishing houses and agents both here and abroad. The letters of the 1880's and 1890's contain a vast amount of information on the vexing copyright problems of those hectic decades. There are probably, including answers, a million letters to be gone over.

The various firm members and editors had their own filing boxes, usually arranged in half yearly periods, and correspondence often overlapped. For example, in 1885 Stevenson might be corresponding with both Charles Scribner and E. L. Burlingame. This correspondence will, therefore, be in two different files and their respective answers will be in two other letter books, while the correspondence with Bangs and Stevenson's English publisher will each be found filed elsewhere again. The task of R. F. Roberts in integrating this material is in itself a vast undertaking.

In an article written for the *American Historical Review* under the title "United States in World War II: Plans for Historiography," Pendleton Herring, executive secretary of the Budget Bureau's Committee on Records of War Administration, states that this war promises to be the "most systematically documented war in history." Indeed, as all know, there threatens to be an "embarrassment of historical riches" unless the significant records are separated from the trivial. Nevertheless, much historical data will be lost unless events are supplemented by the explanatory comments of participants. To prevent an avalanche of records on the one hand and a paucity of certain types of records on the other, a Committee on Records of War Administration was established in the Budget Bureau in March, 1942. This committee

seeks to stimulate major war agencies to maintain adequate records and to provide a special research staff within the Bureau of the Budget to make current administrative analyses. In addition to the executive secretary, the committee has as members: Waldo G. Leland, chairman, American Council of Learned Societies; William Anderson, American Political Science Association; Louis Brownlow, American Society for Public Administration; Donald Young, Social Science Research Council; Solon J. Buck, the National Archives; Archibald MacLeish, Library of Congress; Arthur Schlesinger, American Historical Association; Guy Stanton Ford, American Historical Association.

By special permission, the list of historical officers now heading historical units or projects in various federal agencies is given below:

Historical Officers in Government Agencies

The names of the officials in charge of the historical work in each agency are given. No attempt is made to indicate either their immediate assistants or the officials within the agency who may be in charge of different segments of the work, except in the case of the armed forces.

Department of Agriculture	O. C. Stine
Alien Property Custodian	Fritz Machlup
Office of Censorship	Lt. Theodore F. Koop
Office of Civilian Defense	Elwyn A. Mauck
Committee on Congested Production Areas	Louis P. Birk
Office of Economic Warfare ¹	William L. Tayler
Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation ¹	Grace Fox
Co-ordinator of Inter-American Affairs	Benjamin Margolin
Office of Lend-Lease Administration ¹	Louis K. Hyde, Jr.
National Housing Agency	Helen Monchow
National Research Council	John F. Fulton
Navy Department	
Naval Records and Library	Capt. D. W. Knox
Naval Operations	Lt. Com. Samuel Eliot Morison
Naval Administration	R. G. Albion
Marine Corps	Col. C. H. Metcalf
Coast Guard	Lt. Com. F. R. Eldridge
Petroleum Administration for War	Carl Lokke
Post Office Department	Forest Hall
Office of Price Administration	Robert E. Stone
Office of Scientific Research and Development	James Phinney Baxter
State Department	Graham Stuart
Tennessee Valley Authority	Paul Ager
Veterans' Administration	Kathleen D. Smith
War Department	
Historical Branch	Walter L. Wright and Lt. Col. John Kemper
Army Ground Forces	Maj. Kent Roberts Greenfield

¹ Now part of Foreign Economic Administration.

Army Service Forces	Lt. Col. John D. Millett
Army Air Forces	Col. Clarence T. Lober
Office of War Information	Louise Deming
War Labor Board	John Gambs
War Manpower Commission	Constance Kiehel
Office of War Mobilization	Cassie Connor
War Production Board	James W. Fesler
War Relocation Authority	Ruth Elinor McKee
White House	Fred W. Shipman

In September, 1943, the Social Science Research Council established a Committee on War Studies to supplement the work of historical officers in the federal government by fostering historical activity by state, semipublic, and private organizations. This committee is composed of: Roy F. Nichols, chairman, University of Pennsylvania; Donald Young, University of Pennsylvania; John A. Krout, Columbia University; Shepherd B. Clough, Columbia University; Pendleton Herring, Harvard University; Paul Homan, Cornell University; James P. Baxter, III, Williams College.

This organization and the Committee on Records of War Administration are, since October 28, 1943, co-operating through an Advisory Council on War History. The council seeks to co-ordinate and stimulate historical projects of war administration, both public and private, throughout the nation. The council members are: Guy Stanton Ford, chairman, American Historical Association; Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies; Lewis Brownlow, American Society for Public Administration; Solon J. Buck, National Archives; Archibald MacLeish, Library of Congress; Donald Young, Social Science Research Council; Roy F. Nichols, Social Science Research Council; Pendleton Herring, Budget Bureau; James P. Baxter, III, Williams College; John A. Krout, Columbia University; Shepherd B. Clough, Columbia University; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Harvard University.

CALIFORNIA

It is reported in the December, 1943, issue of *Camera* that the Recorder's Office of Los Angeles County has had 33,000 volumes of its records micro-filmed. These records cover nearly a hundred years of the county's history. About 450,000 feet of film were used and the filing space required was reduced to three per cent of that taken up by the original records.

COLORADO

Dr. LeRoy R. Hafen, executive director and historian of the Colorado Historical Society, made a trip through the state in September to interview pioneers and gather historical data and relics. He especially sought records of the early mining districts, organized by prospectors and miners before Colorado Territory was created. These interesting records are of great historical value,

as they describe the districts, designate the officers, and give the laws that governed property rights and criminal procedure. Some of these records have already been spirited away from Colorado and are held by book collectors and libraries in the East. In conformity with the recently enacted archives law, the Historical Society is gathering, repairing, and preserving these early manuscripts. The following mining district records have been acquired by the society: Records of California Mining District, 1860 (four books); Sacramento District, 1860 (six books); Records of the Arazonia Silver Mining District, Utah Territory, 1860; Lost Canon Mining District, 1860; Washoe District, 1860; Union Gulch District; Arkansas Independent District (two books); Red Mountain District, 1864 (two books); Miners' Court Records; Taylor Park Mining District; Laws and Records of Mosquito District (1861); Fairplay District, Books A, B, and C (1860-1866); Independent Mining District, Books A, B, and C (1861-1863); Montgomery Mining District, Books A, B, and C (1861-1866); Buckskin Joe District (1860); and Index to Lodes, Names of Owners.

CONNECTICUT

The Yale University Library has accessioned the William Robertson Coe collection of Western Americana, including some manuscripts of John Jacob Astor and records of the Hudson's Bay Company.

DELAWARE

One of the noteworthy advancements in the work of the Delaware Public Archives Commission is the establishment of a paper and ink testing laboratory. With the lack of proper materials for making some record papers, it is felt that this work is more essential now than in peacetimes, and for this reason the acquisition of testing equipment is being pushed despite the scarcity of testing instruments.

ILLINOIS

William J. Stratton, state treasurer, announced recently that all state checks now are being microcopied before they are released, thereby giving the state an accurate and permanent record of all disbursements. Each roll of film photographs about six thousand checks and reduces filing space to about two per cent of that required for carbons of the original checks.

Miss Margaret C. Norton, archivist at the state library, is conducting a series of lectures on archival economy for internes working in the Archives Department. One of the internes is Miss Elza Robillard de Marigny, an employee of the Brazilian government, who has been in the United States some time studying the records management methods of government offices, archival institutions, and business firms.

The Newberry Library, Chicago, has acquired the inactive general office files of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy Railroad. Amounting to ten tons of records, this collection of business archives is one of the most valuable sources for the history of the Middle West and the study of railroad economics. Correspondence between Ralph Budd, president of the Burlington, and Stanley Pargellis, librarian of Newberry, pertaining to the accession is published in the September, 1943, issue of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*.

INDIANA

The Indiana History Division of the Indiana State Library has added to its manuscript collections a group of letters of Eugene V. Debs to the secretary of the Socialist Party and other persons. Also acquired are the business papers of the Indianapolis and Bellefontaine Railroad and the Wabash and Erie Canal. The Archives Division has received the Indiana National Guard service records for the years 1880-1921.

KENTUCKY

The University of Kentucky has acquired a large collection of business papers of the John P. Morton Company of Louisville. These records of an outstanding publishing house of the South covers the years 1850-1935.

LOUISIANA

Edwin A. Davis, head of the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University, is on leave of absence to study Mexican archives administration and bibliography in Mexico.

MAINE

The Maine Historical Society announced in October the appointment of Miss Marian B. Rowe as librarian following the resignation of Miss A. Mae Gilman. Miss Rowe reports the accessioning during the past year of collections of manuscripts pertaining to the early history of the town of Bridgton and Gorham, Maine, and the business papers of Ellis B. Usher, who was engaged in Maine lumbering operations during the period 1854-1863.

MARYLAND

The Maryland Historical Society is preparing a history of the society and a guide to its collections. The society has acquired recently the papers of the Baltimore business firms of Smith and Atkinson, 1839-1891, and George R. Riggs and Company, 1817-1842.

MICHIGAN

The Michigan Historical Collections of the University of Michigan has accessioned the noncurrent records of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan, and the personal papers of Mortimer E. Cooley, former dean of the university's College of Engineering and active leader in Michigan public life for many years.

MINNESOTA

Because the Minnesota legislature did not appropriate funds for the War History Committee, an agency of the Minnesota Office of Civilian Defense, the Minnesota Historical Society has taken over the direction of war history work. An article by Jacob Hodnefield about the collecting and preserving of Minnesota war records was published in the May 24, 1943, issue of the *Bulletin* of the Minnesota Defense Council.

Among recent accessions of the Minnesota Historical Society are: business records of the Maine lumbering firm of Judd, Walker, and Company, 1849-1871; diaries and letters of Andrew J. Sterrett, 1849-1865, describing pioneer life in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa; papers of Henry Oldenberg, 1888-1934, relating to forestry and the development of Jay Cooke State Park; the Edmund P. Neill correspondence relating to Minnesota's participation in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection; and the business records of the Minnesota firm of E. W. Backus and Company, 1892-1911.

NEW JERSEY

Governor Edison recently appointed a War Records Commission composed of outstanding leaders of the state's cultural life to guide in the preservation of documents and other source materials pertaining to New Jersey's participation in the war. A leaflet describing the organization, functions, and work of the commission is available from the New Jersey State Library, Trenton 7, New Jersey.

NEW YORK

Whitney R. Cross, curator of the Collection of Regional History at Cornell University has published a report of his year's work to bring together at Cornell "source materials of promising quality and quantity, as well as to create a system for filing, classifying, and preserving acquisitions." He lists fourteen large collections that have been "sorted, catalogued and filed according to their nature on library shelves (bound volumes), in dust-proof boxes within stain-proof folders, or within folders in file drawers." A card index

gives access to significant names and leading subjects covered in these collections.

Clifford Lord, director of the New York State Historical Association, Cooperstown, entered the navy in November, 1943. Miss Janet MacFarlane is acting director.

NORTH CAROLINA

At the request of the State Department of Archives and History, Governor Broughton on May 24, 1943, wrote to request the head of each state department, institution, or agency to name a member of his staff to serve as records administrator to co-operate with the Department of Archives and History in the solution of problems involving the handling, disposal, and preservation of official records. In most cases the response was favorable, and on June 15, 1943, a meeting of the records administrators was held in the offices of the Department of Archives and History, when Governor Broughton emphasized the importance of the program. Dr. R. D. W. Connor, chairman of the department, told how such problems are met by the United States government; and Dr. Christopher Crittenden and Mr. D. L. Corbitt of the department's staff explained how the department will co-operate with other state agencies in the preservation of valuable noncurrent records, the disposal of useless noncurrent records, and the solution of problems involving current records. Since the meeting, a number of requests for service in this field have been met.

Collectors of war records have been appointed for ninety-seven of the state's one hundred counties. In addition, one hundred twenty-two assistant collectors have been named. To date an estimated total of 37,550 war record items has been collected, including soldiers' letters, press releases, posters, pictures, newspapers, and museum items. On August 18, 1943, a one-day school for collectors of war records was held in Chapel Hill, sponsored by the Office of Civilian Defense, the State Department of Archives and History, and the Institute of Government. In spite of travel difficulties, no less than seventy persons were present from all parts of the state. Leading the discussion were R. L. McMillan, state director of civilian defense; R. D. W. Connor, chairman of the State Department of Archives and History; Phillips Russell, president of the North Carolina Society of County Historians; Pauline Hill of the State Library; and Christopher Crittenden, D. L. Corbitt, Miss Charlie Huss, and Mrs. Ellen M. Rollins of the State Department of Archives and History.

Loren C. MacKinney of the University of North Carolina, with the assistance of the library staff and the department of Romance languages, is preparing a list of photofacsimiles (photocopies and films) at the University of North Carolina. Of special importance are the copies of European manuscripts, the originals of which may have been destroyed or may be inaccessible

for years to come. Among the outstanding materials already listed are copies purchased for individual research projects by grants from the university's Smith Fund; films of medieval manuscript sources concerning alchemy; and the holdings of university alumni, even though the holdings are not now at Chapel Hill. Any alumni or friends of the university possessing photofacsimiles of rare books or manuscripts are asked to communicate with Dr. MacKinney.

Recent accessions of the State Department of Archives and History include seventeen photocopies of maps of North Carolina and adjacent regions, 1647-1844; the personal letters of William Bailey Clement, Confederate officer, 1858-1868; records of the North Carolina Press Association, 1942-1943; miscellaneous business papers of John R. Huss of Gastonia, 1860-1900; the John Alexander Robeson Collection, 1734-1941, including Revolutionary materials and genealogical data; and nine scrapbooks from the American Legion Auxiliary, Raleigh.

OHIO

The Department of Documents of the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society has acquired the letters of William T. Coggeshall to Orville James Victor, editor of the Beadle dime novels, and a collection of letters, circulars, and instructions from the General Land Office in Washington to branch offices in Steubenville and Zanesville.

Robert E. Webb has been appointed research assistant to William D. Overman, the archivist and historian of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company in Akron. Mr. Webb was formerly connected with the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society and the Ohio War History Commission.

VIRGINIA

The Tracy W. McGregor Library, University of Virginia, recently acquired the last large group of Jefferson papers known to be still in private hands. Consisting of approximately five thousand items and covering the years 1725-1850, it includes about sixty Jefferson holograph letters and 375 letters to Jefferson. For the most part these are intimate and domestic in nature, for they are the letters Jefferson's daughters and grandchildren wrote the statesman while he was away from Monticello.

To the Jefferson items a large and important group of Governor Wilson Cary Nicholas's letters had been added; Nicholas's daughter married Thomas Jefferson Randolph, grandson of the Sage of Monticello. The Nicholas papers, plus the correspondence of at least two generations of descendants, make up the rest of the collection.

There are twenty-five letters from John Taylor of Caroline to Governor Nicholas, discussing politics of the day, 1806-1808. Taylor disapproved of Madison's compromising attitude toward the Federalists and the correspond-

ence indicates some uneasiness about Jefferson, but Taylor states that nothing altered "my old and well-weighed opinion of Mr. Jefferson." There are also many letters of Thomas Mann Randolph, Edmund Randolph, John Wayles Eppes, Richard Henry Lee, Albert Gallatin, James Madison and others.

The letters of Jane Nicholas and Thomas Jefferson Randolph and those of their children dominate the later period of the collection. They reveal much in the way of the nineteenth century Virginia social life. There is a group of letters from George Wythe Randolph, secretary of war of the Confederacy, which contains in addition to family letters his copies of correspondence with Jefferson Davis and other confederate leaders. Nicholas Trist, Joseph and Ellen Coolidge, and Sarah Nicholas Randolph also figure prominently in the collection.

Morgan P. Robinson, associated with the Archives Division of the Virginia State Library since January, 1915, died on October 24, 1943. Well known as an archivist, Mr. Robinson was a charter member of the Society of American Archivists.

Floyd C. Williams, John Simmons, and Haywood Tyler have left the Archives Division of the Virginia State Library to enter the armed forces, and Virginia Lockett and Dorothy Wood have resigned to accept other employment. The following persons have been added to the Archives Division staff: Mrs. Henry D. Nachman, Ashton Hughes, W. M. Mosely, James Walthall, and Marian Roberts.

WISCONSIN

The Richard T. Ely papers, reflecting economic and sociological thought in America and Western Europe for fifty years, were presented to the Wisconsin State Historical Society as a gift from the great economist, who died last October. The collection includes some 80,000 pieces, and contains many letters from great leaders and literary people who corresponded with Ely during the thirty-three years he served as head of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin.

The annual historical convention of the Wisconsin State Historical Society was held in Milwaukee, September 16-17, 1943. The morning session, September 17, was devoted to a discussion of collecting war records in Wisconsin, the main paper being read by John G. Gregory, who described the state's record collecting experiences during the first World War.